Breviarium Chronologicum.

BEING A

TREATISE

Describing the

Terms and Most Celebrated Characters, Periods and Epocha's us'd in

CHRONOLOGY.

By which that Useful SCIENCE may easily be attained to.

Writ in *Latin* by *Gyles Strauchius, D.D.* and Publick Professor in the University of *Wittebergh.*

And now done into *English* from the Third Edition, with Additions.

Time *of it self is nothing, but from Thought*
Receives its Rise, by lab'ring Fancy wrought,
From things consider'd whilst we think on some
As present, some as past, or yet to come.
Creech's Lucretius.

LONDON,

Printed for *A. Bosvile* at the *Dial* against St. *Dunstan's* Church, and *P. Gilburne* at the *Harrow* the Corner of *Chancery-Lane*, both in *Fleetstreet*, 1699

Mr. *LOCK* in his Thoughts of Education, *page.* 327. ſpeaking of the uſefulneſs of *Chronology*, ſays,

THE moſt uſeful Book I have ſeen in that part of Learning is a Treatiſe of Strauchius, *which is Printed in* 12° *under the Title of* Breviarium Chronologicum, *out of which may be ſelected all that is neceſſary to be taught a Young Gentleman concerning* Chronology.

STRAV-
CHIUS;
CHRONO-
LOGY.

902
St82l-3Es

TO THE

READER.

Reader,

I Here present thee with the Translation of an Author who has never yet appeared in an *English* Dress, one so famous for that sort of Learning he treats of, that I thought it might prove no ungrateful Work to the Publick to make him speak our Language, which has already been so great a Stranger to Chronology, the Subject which our Author here so learnedly handles. In it thou wilt find that Accuracy, Method, and Exactness, that

892386

it may juſtly be eſteemed the moſt uſeful Book of this kind that has ever yet appeared abroad in the World, and withal ſo fully written, that it contains all that is neceſſary to be taught a young Gentleman concerning Chronology.

The Uſefulneſs of this Study I cannot better recommend to thee, than in the Words of the Ingenious and Learned Mr. *Lock*; who thus expreſſes himſelf upon this Occaſion in his *Extraordinary Thoughts concerning Education*: 6. "With Geography (ſays he) "Chronology ought to go "Hand in Hand; I mean, "the general Part of it; ſo "that he may have in his "Mind a View of the whole "Cur-

"Current of Time, and the
"ſeveral conſiderable Epo-
"cha's that are made uſe of
"in Hiſtory. Without theſe
"two, Hiſtory, which is the
"great Miſtriſs of Prudence
"and Civil Knowledge, and
"ought to be the proper
"Study of a young Gentle-
"man, or Man of Buſineſs
"in the World; without Geo-
"graphy and Chronology, I
"ſay, Hiſtory will be very ill
"retained, and very little uſe-
"ful; but be only a Jum-
"ble of Matters of Fact con-
"fuſedly heaped together with-
"out Order or Inſtruction.
"'Tis by theſe that the A-
"ctions of Mankind are
"ranked into their proper
"Places of Times and Coun-
"tries; under which Circum-
"ſtances they are not only

"much easier kept in the "Memory; but in that natu-"ral Order are only capable "to afford those Observations "which make a Man the bet-"ter and the abler for read-"ing them. After this, he extends his due Praises to our Author, as the best Chronologer he has met with yet extant. But herein he only follows the Opinion of the Learned World, which has always discovered a particular Value for this Piece; as may appear by the several large Impressions that have been bought up since its first Publication; And 'tis for this Reason I presume to set it in a clearer Light and more publick View; that so a Book of such General Use and Concernment may not any long-

longer be continued to a particular Set of Men: Upon which ſcore I hope this Tranſlation may meet with an Acceptance and Entertainment ſuitable to the Worth and Character of the Author.

As to the Tranſlation it ſelf, the Author's Method has been followed in every thing, except in that tedious Way, he has made uſe of, by Queſtion and Anſwer; which breaking off ſo often the Thread of the Diſcourſe, renders it leſs pleaſing to the Reader, and not more uſeful. This I have endeavoured, and, think may modeſtly ſay, I have amended, by turning the Author's Queſtions into a Marginal Summary of the adjoining Section; and the Anſwer of it, which in

the Original is long and full of Quotations, into the Section it ſelf; and theſe agree generally the ſeveral Reſponſes there; with which is to be hoped may be more agreeable and eaſier retained by thee.

The Quotations, which are many in the Original, and much uſed by moſt *German* Writers, I have only taken the Sence of, except ſuch as are moſt material, referring thee, if ſuch is thy Curioſity, to the others in the Margin: And where the Author is ſo prolix in Things of little Moment, and only ſhews his Skill in confuting the Author of the Myſtic Chronology, and others not of his Opinion, I have thought fit rather to give thee the Sum of it than cumber thee (as Mr. *Lock* calls

it

it Pag. 328) with his Arguments at large.

And lastly, to make the Work as compleat as I could, I have added several Tables which are of great use for the more clear understanding the ensuing Discourse, particularly that useful one of Mr. *Flamstead*'s about the Equation of Time.

R. S.

THE

CONTENTS.

THE CONTENTS.

Introduction, Page 1

BOOK I.

Of the Terms in Chronology.

Chap. I. *Of some Chronological Terms, viz.* Minutes, Scruples, Moments, p. 8
Ch. II. *Of Hours,* p. 11
Ch. III. *Of Vigils and Watches,* p. 19
Ch. IV. *Of Days,* p. 23
Ch. V. *Of Months,* p. 32
Ch. VI. *Of Years,* p. 39
Ch. VII. *Of Epacts,* p. 48
Ch. VIII. *Of a* Lustrum, Sæculum *or* Ævum, p. 54
Ch. IX. *Of the Epocha, Æra, Cycle and Period,* p. 58

BOOK II.

Of Chronological Characters.

Ch. I. *Of Chronological Characters in general,* p. 60
Ch. II. *Of Hebdomatick or Weekly Characters,* p. 62
Ch. III. *Of the lesser sacred annual Character, or the Sabbatic Cycle,* p. 71.
Ch. IV. *Of the greater sacred annual Character, or the Sabbatic Cycle,* p. 83
Ch. V. *Of the Solar Cycle,* p. 87
Ch. VI. *Of the Lunar Cycle,* p. 91
Ch. VII. *Of the Cycle of Indiction,* p. 97

Ch.

Ch. VIII. *Of the Character of the* Roman *Conſulate*, p. 104

BOOK III.

Of Periods.

Ch. I. *Of the Period of* Calippus, p. 112
Ch. II. *Of the Period of* Hipparchus, p. 119
Ch. III. *Of the* Victorian *Period*, p. 123
Ch. IV. *Of the* Conſtantinopolitan *Period*, p. 125
Ch. V. *Of the* Julian *Period*, p. 131

BOOK IV.

Of the Celebrated Epocha's.

Ch. I. *Of the Epocha of the World*, p. 155
Ch. II. *Of the Epocha of the* Jews, p. 174
Ch. III. *Of the Epocha of the Deluge*, p. 179
Ch. IV. *Of the* Chaldean *Epocha, and the Reigns of the* Aſſyrian *Monarchs*, p. 191
Ch. V. *Of the Epocha of the Years of* Abraham, p. 204
Ch. VI. *Of the Epocha of the* 430 *Years the* Jews *ſojourned in* Ægypt, *of which Mention is made in* Exodus 12. v. 40. p. 211
Ch. VII. *Of the Epocha of* Inachus *the Founder of the Kingdom of* Argos *in* Peloponneſus, *and his Succeſſours*, p. 216
Ch. VIII. *Of the Epocha of* Cecrops, *the firſt Founder of the Kingdom of* Athens, *and his Succeſſours*, p. 219
Ch. IX. *Of the Epocha of the* Iſraelites *leaving of* Ægypt, p. 224
Ch. X. *Of the two Epocha's of the Diviſion of the Land of* Canaan *among the Tribes of* Iſrael; *and of their firſt beginning to cultivate the Ground*, 233

Ch.

Ch. XI. *Of the Epocha of the Deſtruction of* Troy, p. 236
Ch. XII. *Of the Epocha of the Reign of* David *and his Succeſſours in both Kingdoms of* Judah *and* Iſrael, p. 245
Ch. XIII. *Of the Epocha of the Temple of* Solomon, p. 253
Ch. XIV. *Of the Epocha of* 390 *Years of the Iniquity of the Houſe of* Iſrael, *mentioned in* Ezekiel, c. 4. v. 5. p. 260
Ch. XV. *Of the End of the Reign of* Sardanapalus, *and the Epocha of the* Median *Empire*, p. 261
Ch. XVI. *Of the Olympiad Epocha*, p. 265
Ch. XVII. *Of the Epocha of the Building of* Rome, p. 274
Ch. XVIII. *Of the* Nabonaſſarean *Epocha*, p. 280
Ch. XIX. *Of the Epocha of the Conqueſt of* Samaria *by the* Aſſyrians, *and the Deſtruction of the Kingdom of* Iſrael, p. 284
Ch. XX. *Of the Epocha of* Nebuchadonoſor, *who is in the Holy Scripture called* Nebuchadnezzar, p. 290
Ch. XXI. *Of the Epocha and Interval of the* 70 *Years of the* Babylonian *Captivity mentioned in* Chron. 36. p. 292
Ch. XXII. *Of the Epocha of the Deſtruction of the Temple of* Solomon, p. 298
Ch. XXIII. *Of the* Perſian *Epocha of* Cyrus, p. 301
Ch. XXIV. *Of the* Babylonian *Epocha of* Cyrus, *and the End of the firſt Monarchy*, p. 306
Ch. XXV. *Of the Epocha of the Baniſhment of the* Roman *Kings, and the Eſtabliſhment of the Conſular Dignity.* p. 312
Ch. XXVI. *Of the Epocha of the firſt War betwixt the* Greeks *and* Perſians, *or the time of the Battle fought near* Marathon, p. 315
Ch. XXVII. *Of the Expedition of* Xerxes *into* Greece, *and the Epocha of the Battle of* Salamis, 320

Ch.

Ch. XXVIII. *Of the Epocha of the* Peloponnesian *War*, p. 325
Ch. XXIX. *Of the Epocha and Interval of the* 70 *Weeks of* Daniel, *mentioned in* c. 9. v. 24. p. 329
Ch. XXX. *Of the Epocha of the* Græcian *Empire in* Asia, *and the Beginning of the Epocha after the last Battle fought betwixt* Alexander *and* Darius, p. 372
Ch. XXXI. *Of the time of the Death of* Alexander the Great, *and the Epocha of the Years of* Philip, p. 377
Ch. XXXII. *Of the Epocha of the* Seleucides, *which is also called the* Græcian *or* Alexandrian *Epocha*, 382
Ch. XXXIII. *Of the Epocha and time of the* Asmoneans, *who were afterwards called* Maccabæans, p. 386
Ch. XXXIV. *Of the* Antiochian *Epocha*, p. 390
Ch. XXXV. *Of the* Julian *Epocha*, p. 393
Ch. XXXVI. *Of the Epocha of the time of* Herod, *&c.* p. 398
Ch. XXXVII. *Of the* Spanish Æra, *otherwise called the* Æra *of* Cæsar, *or* Æra *of* Æra's, p. 412
Ch. XXXVIII. *Of the Epocha of the Battle of* Actium, *used among the* Ægyptians, p.
Ch. XXXIX. *Of the Ep. of the* Augustus's, p. 419
Ch. XL. *Of the true and vulgar Epocha of Christ*, p. 423
Ch. XLI. *Of the Epocha of the Passion of Christ*, p. 431
Ch. XLII. *Of the Epocha of the last Destruction of* Jerusalem, p. 442
Ch. XLIII. *Of the Epocha of* Diocletian, p. 452
Ch. XLIV. *Of the Epocha of* Constantine the Great, p. 458
Ch. XLV. *Of the Epocha of New* Rome, *or the City of* Constantinople, *and the Division of the* Roman *Empire into Eastern and Western*, p. 467

Ch.

Ch. XLVI. *Of the* Turkiſh *Epocha, commonly called the Epocha of* Hegira, p. 473
Ch. XLVII. *Of the* Perſian *Epocha commonly called* Yezdejerd, p. 474
Ch. XLVIII. *Of the* Jellalæan *Epocha otherwiſe called the Royal Epocha and the Epocha of the* Sultans, p. 475

The End of the Contents.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE *Breviarium Chronologicum*, Concerning the Nature and Conſtitution of CHRONOLOGY.

DEFINITIONS.

1. *Chronology is a Science wherein time* (Quatenus, Quantum) *is conſider'd as to its uſe in Hiſtory.*
2. *Its Diviſion is into General and Special.*
3. *The General part is that which conſiders time in General, with its divers Denominations and Characters; and firſt of all it explains the* Julian Period, *the common Receptacle of all* Epocha's.
4. *The ſpecial part is that which conſiders time in particular, by demonſtrating the certainty of* Epocha's, *and taking a view of all the Calenders or Faſti of divers Nations.*
5. *Therefore the ſpecial part includes a review and computation of* Epocha's.

§. I. SPecial Chronology is a diſcipline diſtinct from other things; its true indeed, few things can be known of time, its definition being obſcure, according to

what St. (a) *Austin* says, *Quid ergo est Tempus? Si nemo ex me quærat, Scio; si quærenti explicare velim, Nescio*; nor is (b) *Cicero* less embarass'd in his thoughts upon it; *Tempus*, says he, *est id quo nunc utimur, &c.* and because of these difficulties, many are for referring all we know of time, to *Astronomy*; but, I think, erroneously, for where-ever an Instructive Object wholly peculiar is at hand and that entire, there is a certain peculiar Discipline distinct from others, and such an Instructive Object is Time, as the whole following discourse will evince.

Chronology a Science.

§. II. Besides Chronology has the conditions requisite to intitle it to the name of a Science, for there's a Scientifick Object, and its affections or properties, as also Chronological characters which supply the place of Causes, as if it were to be shewn, that the year of Christ 1664. was the 6377*th* year of the *Julian* Period, it might be done after this manner; that year which has 21 for the character of the Solar Cycle, 12 for the Lunar, and 2 for the Cycle of Indiction, that is the 6377*th* year of the *Julian* Period, but the 1664*th* year of Christ is such, *Ergo, &c.* and we shall give the Demonstrations of the same in all the Epocha's, and though some err in Chronology, tis the fault of the Artist, not of the Art.

Chronology distinct from History.

§. III. And some erroneously confound History with Chronology; for tho' a Chronologer considers time for the use of History, yet tis certain Chronology and History don't coincide; for Chronology explains time it self, and declares how it comes to be distinguished by such and such Characters. But History only reports things done in time; we have no demonstrations of things done in History, but most certain ones

(a) Aug. 14. Confess. (b) De Invent.

of

of things in Chronology; a Chronologer divides and characterizes time, an Historian collects all passages he can to make his History compleat, but we deny not these Disciplines to be useful to each other, since the Historian receives the Chronologers time noted by Characters, and the other his Actions as Examples. Hence some say, History has two Eyes, *Chronology* and *Geography*, which is not unlike what (*c*) *Scaliger* says, *Chronologia anima Historiæ est, sine quâ Historia non spirat, quæ quanto multò, tanto Chronologia illi præstat, ut corpori anima.* Nor has *Petavius* spoken unwisely. (*d*) *Historia rerum præteritarum est narratio. Chronologia verò rerum earundem certis ex indiciis ad sua tempora temporumque partes accommodatio. Quare huic illa materiam copiamq; suppeditat, hæc illi vicissim formam ac velut Regulam adhibet, illa simplici rerum gestarum ordine contenta est; nec annorum singulorum exactam rationem instituit: hæc annos ipsos quoad licet, annorumq; partes, quibusdam notis ac vestigiis assequitur.*

§. IV. But *Chronology* and the Doctrine of times according to *Petavius* (*e*), seem to differ in this; Chronology says he, is an Art of assigning the Memory of things past in their times, distinguisht by proper Notes and Characters; but the Doctrine of times is a Science which enquires the conditions and properties of time as useful for Mankind; yet we can distinguish no difference between 'em, but *Physical* and *Natural*, for we see not how *Petavius*'s Definitions agree with his promise, who said, *Se velle de natura hujus Scientiæ disserere secundum Philosophos maximèq; Dialecticos.* *Difference of Chronology and doctrine of times.*

§. V. A Science is said to be Subalternate, not *Chronology subalternate, or contain'd in Astronomy.*

(*c*) Prolegom. in Euseb. (*d*) Ration. Temp. part 2. lib. 1. cap. 1. (*e*) Proleg. op. Chronol. c. 3.

only becauſe in the Univerſality of an Object it acknowledges a Superior. In which Senſe all Mathematical Sciences are Subalternate to *Phyſicks*; and as it aſſumes a Subject contain'd in the ſubject of another Science, yet ſo as that it may add ſome accidental difference to it, but alſo as it aſſumes the Concluſions of ſome Subalternate Science in the room of Principles, which conditions may be ſeen among the Schoolmen. Whereas therefore Chronology has not only a Subject contain'd under the object of Aſtronomy, and ſuperadds to it ſome accidental difference, as a diſtinction into certain Periods, and ſuch contemplations as are uſeful to Hiſtory, as alſo aſſumes many other principles out of Aſtronomy, as that the Solar Tropical year is 365 *d.* 5*h.* 49′, that the Lunar Month is 29*d.* 12*h.* 45′. and others of like Sort, it may not unjuſtly be ſaid that Chronology is Subalternate to Aſtronomy, as Muſick to Arithmetick, Opticks to Geometry, *&c.*

A Chronologers Buſineſs.

§. VI. And as in other Sciences the Explication of a Scientifick Subject is requir'd, what principles of *Being* and *Knowing*, what affections and kinds; ſo a Chronologer ought to take care that he explains the nature of time according to theſe Heads; he muſt not confound Meaſure with Meaſuring; whole Theories with Tables of Celeſtial Motions, are not to be propos'd by him who promiſes an Artificial and Scientific Method; in ſhort, he ought not to confound Heaven with Earth.

Rule of Chronological Controverſies.

§. VII. Certain characters of Times and Epocha's, are not to be admitted upon the Authority of any Man, not *Scaligers ipſe dixit*, whoſe Errors *Petavius* has diſtributed into four Heads. The *1ſt* Propheſying without any proof. The *2d* Collections from places of the Ancients ill underſtood. *3d* Falſe Reaſonings. *4th* Self Contra-

Contradictions, which we would not repeat to *Scaliger*'s discredit; every Artificer deserves some praise, though the Art may not be advantageously handled.

§. VIII. (*f*) Some have decry'd all Chronology, except what may be drawn from Sacred Writ; from whose sufficiency tho' we wou'd not detract, yet 'tis certain a perfect Chronology is not to be attained this way; for the Bible leaves off at *Cyrus*, and begins again at *Darius*, which interval must be determin'd from profane History. Hence *Scaliger* rightly, *Actum esset de Chronologia Sacra, si absq; exoticis monumentis foret, quod cum Sapientissimi Scriptores Tatianus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullianus, Africanus, Eusebius, aliiq; animadvertissent omnino sine exotica Historia intervalla sacra deprehendi posse desperarunt. Dicatur igitur tumidis Buccis, elato supercilio atrocem injuriam spiritui sancto fieri, si Historia Sacra ab exotica subsidium petat. Quasi magna illa ignominia sit si Historia exotica Sacræ ancilletur.* *Sacred Writ no exact Chronology.*

§. IX. Yet there's a certain Author who as the Creation of the World was perform'd in 7 days, is for concluding that the N. 7. carries in it great Mysteries, but since there's no reason either in Nature or History for such Surmizes, we shall pass it by as a Dream of one that talkt at adventure. See *Chronologus Mysticus in sole temp. p. 3. & alibi.* *Mystical Chronology of the N. 7.*

§. X. But in Ancient times the Clerks who were esteemed most Learned, had the business of Chronology commended to 'em by the Magistrate; it was not only to the *Alexandrian* Bishop, that the *Indiction* of *Easter* was committed in the Nicene Synod, but it was a most antient Institution. The *Hierophantæ* amongst the Æ- *Of Antient Chronologers.*

(*f*) Matth. Beroaldus, David Paræus, &c.

gyptians and *Greeks*, the Prieſts among the *Jews*, the *Chaldæan South-ſayers* amongſt the *Babylonians*, the *Brachmanes* amongſt the *Indians*, the *Pontifices* amongſt the *Romans*, the *Druids* amongſt the *Gauls*, &c. preſided over the popular Calendars.

Chronology a difficult Science.

§. XI. And altho' we are not willing with *Scaliger* to frighten any one with this paſſage, *Nemo niſi liberalibus diſciplinis & omnigenis Artibus initiatus accedat.* Yet 'tis certain Chronology has ſome difficulties before 'tis attain'd, becauſe the Knowledge of all Sciences is requir'd, and 'tis even immers'd in the Ocean of Mathematicks and Hiſtory.

Of the diviſion of Chronology.

§. XII. The Diviſion of Chronology into a General and Special part ſeems juſt, both from the condition of the Object to be known, which *1ſt* appears to the Humane Mind in general, afterwards in particular; as alſo from the Analogy of other Sciences; for whereas all Sciences may be divided into General and Special, there ſeems a true reaſon, why in delivering the Doctrine of Times, we ſhould not depart from this Method.

According to others.

§. XIII. The following Diviſion is attributed to *Elias*, not the *Thisbite*, but a more Modern Maſter of the *Jews*, *Duo millia inane*, *duo millia Lex*, *duo millia Meſſias*: Which Tradition is divers ways, and almoſt in every Interval erroneous. (*b*) *Auguſtine* divides it thus into ſix Ages: the Firſt from *Adam* to *Noah*, the Second from *Noah* to *Abraham*, the Third from *Abraham* to *David*, the Fourth from *David* to the *Babyloniſh* Captivity, the Fifth from the Captivity to *Chriſt*, the Sixth from the *Coming* of *Chriſt* to the End of the *World*, which the Seventh ſhall receive, comprehending E-

(*b*) Lib. 12. contra Fauſtum.

ternal

ternal Life. And this Division is followed by *Beda* and *Isidore*: According to others these Six Ages are expressed, as in the following Verses;

Primus Adam, Justusque Noe, magnus Pater Abram,
Et posthæc Moses, David, Natusque Redemptor:
Septima sine caret, locat requieque beatos.

Breviarium Chronologicum.

Of the Nature and Constitution of CHRONOLOGY.

BOOK I.

CHAP. I.

Concerning some Terms in Chronology, and those the most common, viz. *Minutes, Scruples and Moments.*

1. *A Minute is usually the least Part of time, which is commonly called a* Scruple.
2. *A Scruple is one thing as it is taken in the usual and Mathematical sense, and another as it is receiv'd in the* Jewish.
3. *The Vulgar and Mathematical Scruple is the 60th part of an Hour, divisible into 60 other Parts, and so on; whence they are called* $1'$ $2''$ $3'''$ $4''''$, &c.
4. *A* Jewish *Scruple is the 1080th part of an Hour, divided usually farther into Moments.*
5. *A* Jewish *Moment is the 76th part of a Scruple.*

§. 1. FAbricius Paduanus (a) hath observ'd that the ancient Chronologers divided the Hours into *Points, Moments, Uncias* and *Atomes*: So that the Point was the 4th part of

The Ancients Division of an Hour.

(a) *In Cuten Temp. Annul. p.* 35.

an

an Hour, a Moment the 10th part of a Point, an Uncia the 12th part of a Moment, and an Atome the 47th part of an Uncia; so that a whole Hour contains 4 Points, 40 Moments, 480 Uncia's, 22560 Atomes; but this Division is now grown obsolete.

Mathematical Division.

§. 2. Yet Chronologers as well as Mathematicians, do not only divide the Hours and its Parts, but also every Total, or any thing that is like it, into 60 Scruples: For although the Division of the whole into Points may be free, yet, to avoid the Trouble of computing which Fractions cause, except the 10 (which is still better) a more fit than this can't be found out, especially if it be observed that those 60 Parts may be used as Integers, as it may be more at large shewn in Arithmetick.

The Jewish Division.

§. 3. But the Author of the New Moons gives this account why the *Jews* divided the Hour into 1080 Scruples, *viz.* that because there is no Number more easily divisible into so many Parts as is the 1080, being that it can be divided by 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 15, 20, &c.

Institution of it Divine.

§. 4. And this the *Jews*, according to their wonted Superstition and Boastings of Revelations, will not have of any Humane Invention, but assert it to be Divine. Concerning which, *R. Samuel* saith, *Isachar* ascended into Heaven, and brought from thence 1080 Parts.

By others used.

§. 5. Neither would they have this to have been used by any others besides themselves, since that from *Aben Ezra* to the 12th Chapter of *Exodus* these Portions are called the *Parts* of *Israel*, tho' very falsely, *Scaliger* having observed (*b*) that both the *Samaritans*, *Arabians* and *Persians*, as well as other Eastern Nations have made use of this Division as well as they.

(*b*) Lib. 1. de Emend. Temp.

§. 6. How

How to reduce Mathematical to Jewish Scruples.

§. 6. However to reduce those *Jewish* Scruples to the Mathematical, and these again to the *Jewish*, you may say, If 60 Mathematical Scruples give 1080 *Jewish*, how many will the aforesaid Mathematical Scruples give? And again, if 1080 *Jewish* Scruples be equal to 60 Mathematical Scruples, how many of them will be equal to the aforesaid Number of these? And it will appear when the Operation is finished, that one Mathematical Scruple contains 18 *Jewish*, and one *Jewish* 3″ 20‴ of the Mathematical; and on this Accounts are the following Tables calculated.

Math.	Jud.	*Math.*	Jud.	*Math.*	Jud.
1	18	6	108	20	360
2	36	7	126	30	540
3	54	8	144	40	720
4	72	9	162	50	900
5	90	10	180	60	1080

Jud.	*Math.*		Jud.	*Mathem.*			Jud.	*Mathem.*		
	″	‴		′	″	‴		′	″	‴
1	3	20	20	1	6	40	200	11	6	40
2	6	40	30	1	40	0	300	16	40	0
3	10	0	40	2	13	20	400	22	13	20
4	13	20	50	2	46	40	500	27	46	40
5	16	40	60	3	20	0	600	33	20	0
6	20	0	70	3	53	20	700	38	53	20
7	23	20	80	4	26	40	800	44	26	40
8	26	40	90	5	0	0	900	50	0	0
9	30	0	100	5	33	20	1000	55	33	20
10	33	20								

§. 7. *Epiphanius* reports, that divers of the *Marcosians* (so called from one *Marcus* a celebrated Wife

Wise Man who espoused the *Valentinian* Heresie) divided the Hour into 30 Parts, which Division was not peculiar to them, but comprehended the two Equinoctial Hours; whence undoubtedly it came to pass, that whereas 30 Degrees were equal to that time, the *Marcosians* divided their compounded Hour into so many Parts. So likewise the Inhabitants of *Cataja* (which the Ancients called *Serica*) and the Subjects of the great *Cham* of *Tartary* divide the Year into 24 equal Parts; so that every Part contains 15 Days and 2814 Particles, and ten thousand of these Particles (every one of which they call a *Fenack*) answer to one Day amongst them; Of which more hereafter.

Of some that divide the Hours otherwise.

CHAP. II.

Concerning Hours.

1. *An Hour is commonly called the 24th part of a Day.*
2. *There are two sorts of Hours; some are called equal, others unequal.*
3. *Equal Hours, which the* Greeks *call* ἰσοωρεναὶ, *are those in which the Night and Day are divided into 24 equal Parts.*
4. *Unequal Hours, which the* Greeks *call* Καιρικαὶ, *are those wherein the time of the natural Day is divided into 12 Parts, and the Night into as many.*

§. 1. ALthough some will have the Word *Hour* in *Latin*, *Hora*, divided from the *Greek* Word ὁρίζειν, which signifies to limit or bound; because it is the Measure of time; yet the most com-

The Derivation of the Word Hour.

common Opinion is, that its Original is owing to the *Egyptians*; becauſe *Macrobius* *, and from him many others obſerve, that the Sun with them was called *Horum*; of which Opinion *Pauſanias* was alſo long ſince.

* Saturn. l. 1. c. 21.

What it ſignifi'd formerly.

§. 2. But the Word *Hour* has not always been of the ſame ſignification; but in ancient times an Hour did indefinitely expreſs a ſhort ſpace of time; in which ſenſe the LXX Interpreters have ſometimes tranſlated it, and *Ulpian* in *Athenæus* (not without Reaſon) doubteth whether it may be uſed as for a Definite, or ſet part of the Day in the Writings of the Ancient *Greeks*. Certain it is in St. *Luke* ὥρας δείπνου, is uſed for Supper-time. Beſides, *Homer* calls ὥρας the *Cœli janitrices*; to which *Ovid* alludes, bringing in *Janus*.

St Luke ch. 14. v. 17.

Præſideo foribus cœli cum mitibus Horis.

Some believe that heretofore the four Seaſons of the Year, wherein the Sun finiſhed its Courſe, had the Name of *HOURS*, as ancient Writings do teſtifie. Others there are would have the Reaſon hereof to be, that becauſe an *Horus* inſtituted a certain three-monthly Year; therefore the Ancients called Spring, Summer, Autumn and Winter Years; nay the Year it ſelf *Horus*; of which thing ſome Footſteps appear in this, that the *Greek Annals* called them their *Hori*, and their Writers *Horographici*. And others there are alſo who in a particular Acceptation of the Word, think that the *Greeks* call that Part of Time an Hour wherein the *Dog-Star* ariſes; whence *Galen* in his Book *de Alimentis* calls thoſe *Horean Fruits* which ſprung up at that time wherein the *Dog-Star* aroſe; and *Horace* ſays,

Fla-

Flagrantis atrox hora Caniculæ, &c. Lib. 3. O. 1 30

So that in general the Ancients by an Hour have ſignify'd an Age; by the 12th Hour, Old Age, as in that Dialogue of M. *Craſſus*, and the King of *Galatia*. *What mean you?* ſays he, *art not thou now arrived at the 12th Hour, and yet talkeſt of building a new City?*

Why the Ancients divided the Day into 12 Parts.

§. 3. *Herodotus* relates, (*a*) that the *Græcians* received from the *Ægyptians* the Uſe of the Pole, the *Gnomon*, and *the twelve Parts of the Day*: and *Pierius Valerianus* (*b*) ſays, that the Original of that Uſe among the *Ægyptians* was, becauſe their Prieſts were wont twelve times a Day to cry aloud with a howling Noiſe to their *Cynocephalus*; and both *Cicero* and *Marius Victorinus* have taken notice of ſuch a Ceremony to *Serapis*.

Galen remarks other things of this Number, *viz.* that the *Romans* uſed it not only for their Hours, but alſo in Weights, Meaſures, *&c.* as being a Number diviſible into many aliquot Parts.

What Hours the Ancients had.

§. 4. And doubtleſs Aſtronomers according to the Motion of the *Æquator*, have conſtituted equal Hours, yet it is apparent that the Ancients uſed the unequal more than the equal Hours. St. *John* ſays (*c*), *are there not 12 Hours of the Day?* which muſt be falſe, if Equinoctial: As likewiſe St. *Matthew* (*d*) in the Parable of the Vineyard; where thoſe that came at 11, ſtaid but one Hour; and that place of *Plautus* in *Pſeudolus* (*e*), muſt mean the ſame Hours, as well as this of *Martial*:

(*a*) Lib. 2. (*b*) Hieroglyph. Lib. 6. (*c*) St. John c. 10. 9. (*d*) Mat. 20. (*e*) Act. 5. Sc. 9.

Otia

Otia, Prisce, brevi poteris donare libello:
Hora nec æstiva est, nec tibi tota perit.

The dividing Days into Hours the most ancient Way.

§. 5. It is not known at what time the Custom of dividing the Days into Hours began among the *Ægyptians*, yet undoubtedly it is but of short standing amongst other Nations, and chiefly the *Romans*, which *Censorinus* (*f*) observes as an Argument that the Word *Hour* was not known amongst the *Romans* 300 Years after the Building of the City, by reason there is not any mention made of 'em in the 12 Tables, as the other Laws after that time do; before which the Divisions were only before and after Noon,

The Turks divided their.

§. 6. The *Turks* not having Clocks as we have, the Priests in their stead stopping their Ears with their Fingers, proclaim from the Top of their *Mosks* the Cock-crow, the Break of Day, Noon-tide, Three of the Clock and Twi-light, with a very high Voice: The same Custom the old *Romans* used, as appears by *Martial.*

Horas quinque, puer, nondum tibi nuntiat, & tu
Jam conviva mihi, Cæciliane, venis.

And in *Athenæus* mention is made of λαλάγυρος ὡρολογητὴς, a *mercenary Hour-teller*; and also of ὁμολογητὴς παράσιτος, a *Parasite that declared Supper-time.*

The Ancients manner of noting the Hours of the Day.

§. 7. But amongst the many Instruments the Ancients made use of to distinguish their Hours, the Sun-Dial or *Heliotropia* is certainly the most ancient. For, in the Holy Scripture we read (*g*) of *Ahaz*'s Dial, where that great Miracle was wrought of the Sun's going back

(*f*) *de Nat. Deorum. C.* 23. (*g*) 2 *King.* 20.

ten

ten Degrees; about which not only *R. Solomon*, but other Interpreters agree that those Degrees were the Indices of such parts of the Day: Nor do we believe that this so publick a Machine was only in use amongst Mathematicians, as *Salmasius* fancies, against whom *Dion. Petavius* very well urgeth, that then it would not be the Custom to erect them so publickly in the Market-places; and much more from hence the Falsity of a contrary Opinion doth appear, that the Use of Fortune-tellers and Astrologers were very severely forbidden by the *Jews*. However, the Use of Dials was not only long since known to the *Jews* but to other Nations, as the *Greeks*, as *Diogenes Laertius* reports; and the *Romans*, as *Pliny* (*h*) relateth. *Pomponius* also gives an Account of a famous Dial in the Field of *Mars*, which *Persius* speaks of when he says,

Stertimus indomitum quod despumare Falernum
Sufficiat quinta dum linea tangitur umbra.

§. 8. And since we cannot at all times be so happy as to enjoy the Light of the Sun, the ancient *Romans* or rather the *Greeks*, to make some amends for the frequency of Storms, *&c.* found out, according to the Ingenuity of that Age, an artificial Invention. The Author, as *Pliny* (*i*) writes, was *Scipio Nasica*; which *Pancirollus* gives the following Description of; *They took*, says he, *a Vessel made of Glass, in the bottom of which was a narrow Hole done about with Gold, lest the Water should wear it away. On the other part of the Vessel was drawn a right Line, having the twelve Hours set upon it; after which they filled the Vessel with* *A Description of the Roman Clepsydra.*

(*h*) D. L. Lib. 7. C. 60. (*i*) L. 7. C. 60.

Wa-

Water which iſſued Drop by Drop out of the little Hole; they thruſt a Cork into the Water, faſtned to a little Wand, the end of which pointed at the 1ſt Hour, and as the Water fell down more at the 2d, 3d, &c. Hours. This in the *Greek* was called a *Clepſydra*, and with us an *Hour-Glaſs*.

Natural Hours not every where unequal.

§. 9. Natural Hours are not every where unequal, ſince that there cannot be any difference of Hours Artificial and Natural, as to the Quantity, with thoſe that live under the middle of the *Torrid Zone*, or under the *Æquator*, where theSigns of the Zodiack aſcend directly: Yet is it otherwiſe with thoſe that live under the *Temperate Zone*, if the Sun be in the *Equinoctial* Points.

Ἰσημερίαι, Equal one with another.

§. 10. And it is commonly thought, that all the Hours of the Day, which they call *ἰσημεριαὶ*, are equal one with another; not conſidering, that the very Days from Noon to Noon are unequal; and then their Parts can never be equal; but ſince the Inequality is but little, a *Mathematician* ought to know it; but 'tis but of little moment in ordinary Uſes.

Why artificial are called Planetary.

§. 11. Unequal Hours are called *Planetary*; becauſe *Aſtrologers* have taught with greater Vanity and Superſtition than Certitude, that the ſeveral Planets rule in ſeveral Hours, beginning this Order from the firſt Hour on *Sunday*, and continuing of it, as you may ſee in the Table annext; in which it is ſuppoſed againſt all Aſtronomick Reaſon, that *Venus*, *Mercury*, and the *Sun* were the Inferiour Planets; *Mars*, *Jupiter*, and *Saturn* Superiour ones. All which were the Dreams of an unhappy Age.

DAYS.

A Table of the

Hours of the Day.	DAYS. I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
1.	☉	☽	♂	☿	♃	♀	♄
2.	♀	♄	☉	☽	♂	☿	♃
3.	☿	♃	♀	♄	☉	☽	♂
4.	☽	♂	☿	♀	☿	♄	☉
5.	♄	☉	☽	♂	☿	♃	☿
6.	♃	☿	♄	☉	☽	♂	☿
7.	♂	☿	♃	☿	♄	☉	☽
8.	☉	☽	♂	☿	♃	☿	♄
9.	☿	♄	☉	☽	♂	☿	♃
10.	☿	♃	☿	♄	☉	☽	♂
11.	☽	♂	☿	♃	☿	♄	☉
12.	♄	☉	☽	♂	☿	♃	☿

Hours of the Night	DAYS. I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
1.	♃	☿	♄	☉	☽	♂	☿
2.	♂	☿	♃	☿	♄	☉	☽
3.	☉	☽	♂	☿	♃	☿	♄
4.	☿	♄	☉	☽	♂	☿	♃
5.	☿	♃	☿	♄	☉	☽	♂
6.	☽	♂	☿	♃	☿	♄	☉
7.	♄	☉	☽	♂	☿	♃	☿
8.	♃	☿	☽	♄	☉	☽	☿
9.	♂	☿	♃	☿	♄	☉	☽
10.	☉	☽	♂	☉	☽	☿	♄
11.	☿	♄	☉	☽	♂	☿	♃
12.	☿	♃	☿	♄	☉	☽	♂

How to reduce the unequal to equal.

§. 12. Unequal Hours may be reduced to equal, by knowing firſt the Quantity of the Natural Day: of which the time, of the Year and Place being given and known; ſay, as 12 Hours is to the Quantity of the Natural Day, ſo is one equal Hour to the unequal Hour that anſwers it; by this means the Proportion between equal and unequal Hours will be ſo well known, that it will be very eaſie to reduce them. For Example, ſuppoſe here at *Wittebergh*, That the greateſt Natural Day is 16 Hours and an half; then one equal Hour 22′ 30″ will anſwer to an unequal Hour, or the twelfth Part of the *Natural Day*.

Of the Denominations of Hours.

§. 13. There are ſeveral Computations of an Hour amongſt ſeveral Nations in their Denominations and ſetting of them in order. The *Græcians* commonly began theirs from the *Riſing* of the *Sun*, the *Italians* from its *Setting*, the *Europeans* generally from *Midnight*; but the *Unequal Hours*, ſome do term them the *Jewiſh*, as alſo *Ancient*.

The Ancients Diviſion of Hours for Labour.

§. 14. The Cuſtom of the *Romans* in their *Diviſion* of their ſeveral Hours of the Day for their ordinary Concerns, *Martial* gives us the following Account of, *viz.*

Prima ſatulantes atque altera continet hora;
Exercet raucos tertia cauſidicos;
In quintam varios extendit Roma labores;
Sexta quies laſſis; ſeptima finis erit;
Sufficit in nonam nitidis octava palæſtris;
Imperat extructos frangere nona toros.
Hora libellorum decima eſt Eupheme meorum,
Temperat Ambroſias cum tua cura dapes.
Et bonus æthereo laxatur nectare Cæſar
Ingentique tenet pocula parca manu:

Tunc

Tunc admitte jocos greſſu metire licenti,
Ad matutinum noſtra Thalia Jovem.

But the *Greeks* uſed ſix Hours only for the diſpatching their Affairs, ſpending the reſt in the Refreſhment of the Body and Mind; whence theſe Verſes,

Sex Horis tantum rebus tribuuntur agendis,
Vivere poſt illas littera Zeta monet.

As alſo,

In ſextam labor uſq; horam: namque inde notantur
Litterulis vitæ commoda habere jubent.

CHAP. III.

Of Vigils and Watches.

1. *A Vigil is a certain ſpace of Time, wherein the Natural Day and the following Night was formerly divided into certain Parts, ſo called from the changings of Centinels or Watch-men.*
2. *There are two Vigils, one of the Day, and the other of the Night.*
3. *Thoſe of the Day, or rather Centries, Watch and Wards, were moſt commonly four equal Parts of a Natural Day, each of which contained three Hours.*
4. *And thoſe of the Night, with ſome Nations were four equal Parts of the Night, of the ſame Continuance with the former.*

1. THE *Ancient Diviſion* of the *Night* and *Day*, were into *Evening* and *Morning*; of which the Hiſtory of the Creation often makes uſe. *The Ancient Diviſion of the Night.*

makes mention; and although the Lights were not created till the third Day, yet the Motion of the first Light resembling the Sun that follow'd after, might make a distinction of *Evening* and *Morning*.

The Names of the Vigil.

§. 2. The Name of *Vigils* or *Watches* arose from the Watchmen changing their Posts every three Hours, lest they might either fail, and be over-wearied for want of Sleep, or that too much time might be given to the Enemy to execute their treacherous Practices against the City; whence it's plain, that it had its first Rise from a *Military Custom*; and this *Flavius Vegetius* (*a*) confirms, giving this Account of the same; namely, *That out of every Century four Horse, and as many Footmen were drawn forth to keep the Watch, and that because it was difficult for the same to keep Guard all Night: Therefore was it thought necessary to divide it into four Parts*, according to the Order describ'd before: The Watch was set by Sound of *Trumpet*, and call'd off by that of the *Cornet*: Besides which the Tribunes appointed some of the chiefest to go about the Watch to see if any were remiss in, or left their Posts.

The Jews Vigils.

§. 3. But since we can find little about the Days Watches, we shall only speak of those of the *Night*. Some think that the *Jews* divided the Night at least into three *Watches*, the first of which began at *Sun-set*, and lasted till *Midnight*; whence in *Job* (*b*) it is called the Time when deep Sleep falleth on Men. The second is supposed to begin at *Midnight*, and end at the *Cock-crow*, where the third commences, lasting until the *Sun* begins to *rise*. And indeed the *Jews* themselves do frequently make mention of three Watches: For in their *Thalmud* (*a*)

(*a*) *De Re Mil. Lib.* 3. (*b*) *C.* 4. *v.* 13.

Book

Book of Prayers and Thanksgivings) *R. Isaac* the Son of *Samuel* saith, *There are three* Watches *of the Night, in every one of which the Holy and Blessed God sitteth roaring like a Lyon; and saith, Woe unto you Children; for I have devoured my House by reason of your Sins, and burnt my Temple*, &c. and the like you may find in *R. Salom (c)*: But in the time of the New Testament it is plain, that the Night was divided into four *Watches*, a Custom probably introduced by the *Romans*; as in those Places of *Mat.* 14. *v.* 25. *Mark* 6. *v.* 48. *c.* 13. *v.* 35. in which sense *Suidas* interpreteth φυλακὴν, calling it the fourth Part of the Night.

Received from the Romans.

§. 4. Some think that the *Jews* received this Custom of dividing the Night into *Watches*, from the *Romans*, yet without much Ground: For as much as mention is made of the *Jewish Vigils* before ever the Name or *Empire* of the *Romans* was known to the *Jews*: But it cannot be denied but that the *Jews* followed the *Roman* Custom when the *Jewish* Policy began to decline.

Another sort of Vigils.

§. 5. Yet the famous *Scaliger (d)* is of opinion that the *Jews* as well as the *Romans* and *Greeks* divided their Night and Day into four Parts, and called those Quarters the *Vigils*; the first of which (as he says) was from *Sunset* to *Midnight*: The second also called the *Middle*, as being betwixt the two *Suns*, *viz.* the *Setting* of the one, and *Rising* of the other, was from *Midnight* to the *Sun-rise*. After these was the *Morning-Watch*, which began at *Sun-rise*, and continued till *Noon*: The last continued from *Noon* till *Sun-set*.

How the Romans divided the νυχθήμερον.

§. 6. But the *Romans* distinguished their *Night* and *Day* by various Names; some of which we

(c) *Ad Ex.d* 14. *Conf Jud.* 7. 19. (d) L. 7. *de Em. Tem. p.* 637

find in the twelve Tables and others elſewhere, the Beginning and End was *Midnight*; after followed the *Night*, after this the *Cock-crow*, after this the *Dead of the Night*, after this *before Day*, after this *Day-break*, after this the *Morning*, after this the *Forenoon*, then *Noon*; after this the *Afternoon*, then *late*; after this the *Evening*, then *Twilight*; after this *Candle-light*, after that *Bed-time*, after that *far in the Night*, then to *Midnight*, and ſo *Midnight* again.

How they and the Greeks agreed in this matter.

§. 7. However we are yet in the dark as to the *Greeks* agreeing with the *Romans*, although it is no doubt, but that in the time of War the *Romans* divided their Night into four Parts; and ſome think, that the *Greeks* imitated them herein; tho' many Places in ancient Writings ſeem to contradict it: From which it appears, that the *Greeks* divided their Day and Night rather into three than four Parts; as appears by *Seneca* in *Thyeſte*, where the *Chorus* is introduced thus: *Quo terrarum, &c.* And in *Andromache* thus:

Sen. Trag.

Partes ferè nox alma tranſierat duas,
Clarumque ſeptem verterant ſtellæ jugum, &c.

And the *Scholiaſt* very clearly on the 10th Iliad of *Homer*: For as the Poet divided the Day into three Parts, *viz.* into *Morning*, *Noon* and *Evening*, ſo does he the Night: τριφύλακτον γὰρ ἤθελεν εἶναι τὴν νύκτα: For he would have the Night to conſiſt of *Three Vigils*.

Hom. Iliad.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Days.

1. *A Day is that Space of time wherein the Sun in its riſing and ſetting, performs either an entire Courſe, or a certain Part of the Globe.*
2. *It is commonly divided into Natural and Civil.*
3. *That Space of time is called the Natural Day, which paſſeth betwixt Sun-riſe and Sun-ſet.*
4. *The Civil Day is that which contains one Revolution of the Heavens, and ſo including alſo the Night, diſtinct from the Natural Day, whence the* Greeks *call it* νυχθήμερον.
5. *Days alſo are either Holy-Days or not.*
6. *Holy-Days are thoſe wherein Buſineſs is laid aſide; which the* Romans *formerly called* Nefaſti.
7. *And thoſe are made holy, either by Divine or Humane Authority.*
8. *Some People by Divine Right obſerve* Sundays *and other Holy-Days.*
9. *But many Nations by Humane Impoſition did heretofore vainly obſerve ſeveral Days, and do at this time; as may appear in the enſuing Diſcourſe, and the various ways of chuſing them.*
10. *Thoſe that are not Holy-Days, but Work-Days, are alſo called* Faſti, *being thoſe wherein the ſolemn Offices are not performed either to the true God, or the falſe Gods of the* Gentiles.

The reaſon of the Natural and Civil Day.

§. 1. THoſe that call that Space of time a *Natural Day* wherein the Sun is upon the Horizon, are chiefly moved thereto, be-

cause Nature and not Art effects that *Day*, but those that would have it an entire Revolution of the Sun, alledge that Nature intends a perfect Circulation, likewise νυχθήμερος is called a civil *Day*, because that the Citizens were wont to use it in dating their Contracts and other Civil Actions; and again they call the Suns staying upon the Horizon an Artificial Day, since that it's then convenient for Artificers to do their Work; and as some will add, because the Differences of such days cannot be made, but by the Workmanship of Almighty God, and may be understood by the use of an *Artificial Sphere*.

Not the same with all Authors.

§. 2. But an *Artificial Day* is not taken in the same Sence by all Authors, for what in *Chronology* we call a *Natural Day*, the same the *Astronomers* usually term an *Artificial*, and what we call a *Civil*, they call *Natural*.

The measure of a Civil day.

§. 3. The measure of the *Civil Day* (according to *Chronologers*) and the *Natural* (according to *Astronomers*) is by the daily Motion of the Sun round the Earth, or as *Astronomers* do otherwise speak, it is an entire *Revolution* of the *Æquator*, with so much over as answereth to the Suns own Motion, receding in the mean time on the Ecliptick, whence the Complements are unequal. The mean ones are 59′. 8″. in time 3′. 57″, by which part of time the Solar days exceed the day of the *Primum Mobile*.

The difference thereof.

§. 4. The difference of a *Natural* day from the *Civil*, consisteth in their equality and inequality, some calling those that are unequal *Natural* days, and those that are equal *Civil*, though very absurdly; for those that dwell under the *Æquator*, have all Natural days *equal*, and if we should speak truly, *Civil* days are not equal, by reason of the inequality of what is added; so if a *Country* just under the *Pole* was habitable, its Inhabitants would have their

Natural

Natural day neither *equal* nor *unequal*; for it is called *equal* or *unequal*, in reſpect of each other; however they would know no other day till the year was paſt. Yet it is true in an Oblique Sphere, for its Inhabitants would have their Natural days unequal, whence *Ovid* when he would deſcribe an impoſſibility, ſays,

Longa dies citior brumali tempore, noxque
Tardior hybernâ ſolſtitialis erit. *Lib. de Ponto 2.*

And heretofore alſo *Boetius*.

Tu Frondiſluæ frigore brumæ,
Stringis lucem breviore rotâ.
Tu cum fervida venerit æſtas,
Agiles noctis dividis horas.

§ 5. Yet all *Civil* days are equal and preciſely 24 hours, for in that time an entire *Revolution* of the *Æquator* from riſing to ſetting is performed; but becauſe the Sun like other Stars whilſt it turns round ſo quickly upon the *Æquator*, haſtens towards its riſe, performing its mean daily courſe in 59′. 8″. but the ſpace is unequal and hence the former degree of the Ecliptick, together with a degree of the *Æquator* being come to the Meridian, the Sun wants ſome little ſpace; to compleat which, a little part of time ſhould be added, beſides 24 hours which by reaſon of the Suns apparent unequal Motion, will be unequal as above, but this is fully rectified by the Famous Aſtronomer Mr. *Flamſted*, in his Calculation of the following Table of Æquation of Time. *viz.* *All Civil days preciſely 24 hours.*

A Table of the Equation of Days, by which may be found how much a good *Pendulum Watch* ought to be faster or slower than a true Sun-Dial, every day in the Year.

Days.	Januar.		Februa.		March.		April.		May.		June.	
	′	″	′	″	′	″	′	″	′	″	′	″
1	8	52	14	46	10	08	0	46	4	12	1	02
2	9	14	14	45	9	51	0	30	4	14	0	49
3	9	36	14	43	9	34	0	14	4	14	0	36
4	9	58	14	40	9	17	0	01	4	14	0	24
5	10	19	14	36	9	00	0	17	4	14	0	12
6	10	38	14	32	8	42	0	32	4	13	0	01
7	10	58	14	27	8	24	0	46	4	12	0	14
8	11	17	14	21	8	06	1	00	4	10	0	27
9	11	35	14	14	7	47	1	14	4	08	0	40
10	11	52	14	07	7	28	1	28	4	05	0	53
11	12	09	14	00	7	09	1	40	4	02	1	07
12	12	26	13	52	6	50	1	52	3	58	1	20
13	12	40	13	43	6	32	2	04	3	54	1	33
14	12	53	13	33	6	13	2	16	3	48	1	46
15	13	06	13	23	5	54	2	27	3	43	1	58
16	13	18	13	12	5	36	2	37	3	37	2	11
17	13	30	13	01	5	17	2	47	3	30	2	23
18	13	42	12	49	4	58	2	57	3	23	2	36
19	13	51	12	36	4	38	3	06	3	15	2	49
20	13	59	12	23	4	19	3	15	3	07	3	01
21	14	08	12	10	4	01	3	23	2	59	3	12
22	14	16	11	56	3	42	3	30	2	51	3	23
23	14	23	11	42	3	23	3	37	2	43	3	34
24	14	29	11	28	3	05	3	43	2	33	3	45
25	14	33	11	13	2	46	3	49	2	22	3	55
26	14	37	10	57	2	28	3	54	2	10	4	06
27	14	41	10	41	2	11	3	58	1	58	4	16
28	14	44	10	25	1	53	4	02	1	46	4	25
29	14	45			1	36	4	06	1	34	4	34
30	14	46			1	19	4	08	1	24	4	43
31	14	46			1	02			1	13		

Watch too fast. *Watch too slow.*

A Table of the Equation of Days, by which may be found how much a good *Pendulum Watch* ought to be faster or slower than a true Sun-Dial, every day in the year.

Days.	July.		Aug.		Sept.		Octob.		Nov.		Dec.	
	′	″	′	″	′	″	′	″	′	″	′	″
1	4	52	4	42	3	40	13	15	15	29	5	53
2	4	59	4	32	4	00	13	28	15	21	5	25
3	5	06	4	21	4	21	13	42	15	12	4	57
4	5	13	4	11	4	42	13	55	15	02	4	27
5	5	20	4	00	5	03	14	08	14	51	3	57
6	5	27	3	48	5	24	14	20	14	40	3	28
7	5	33	3	36	5	45	14	32	14	27	2	59
8	5	37	3	23	6	06	14	43	14	14	2	30
9	5	41	3	10	6	26	14	53	14	00	2	00
10	5	44	2	56	6	47	15	03	13	46	1	29
11	5	48	2	42	7	08	15	12	13	30	0	59
12	5	51	2	27	7	28	15	21	13	13	0	28
13	5	54	2	12	7	49	15	29	12	56	0	*02
14	5	55	1	56	8	09	15	36	12	38	0	32
15	5	56	1	40	8	29	15	42	12	18	1	02
16	5	56	1	23	8	49	15	48	11	59	1	32
17	5	56	1	07	9	09	15	53	11	39	2	01
18	5	55	0	50	9	29	15	57	11	18	2	31
19	5	54	0	*33	9	49	16	00	10	54	3	00
20	5	52	0	15	10	08	16	02	10	34	3	29
21	5	50	0	*03	10	26	16	04	10	11	3	57
22	5	47	0	22	10	44	16	05	9	48	4	25
23	5	43	0	41	11	02	16	05	9	24	4	53
24	5	39	1	00	11	20	16	05	8	59	5	20
25	5	34	1	19	11	37	16	04	8	34	5	48
26	5	28	1	38	11	54	16	01	8	08	6	15
27	5	22	1	58	12	11	15	58	7	42	6	41
28	5	15	2	18	12	28	15	54	7	14	7	07
29	5	07	2	39	12	44	15	49	6	47	7	33
30	4	59	2	59	13	00	15	43	6	20	7	58
31	4	51	3	19			15	36			8	23

Watch too fast. *Watch too slow.* *Watch too fast.* *Watch too slow.*

The Ancient Diſtinction between Civil and Natural days.

§. 6. That the *Diſtinction* of the *Day* into *Natural* and *Civil* is very ancient, plainly appears by that Stratagem the *Thracians* formerly made uſe of, which as *Strabo* relates *(a)* was thus. *Ephorus* ſays he, Writes that the *Thracians making Truce with the* Boetians *(ſo that then they might have leſs regard to their Camps) fell upon 'em by Night and deſtroyed them, whereby they broke the Truce; but the* Thracians *denyed they did any ſuch thing, ſince that the Truce was made for the days, and they fell upon them by Night; whence is the Proverb,* Thracicum Commentum: The like Story *Plutarch* relates in's *Laconick Apophthegms.*

Of the various beginnings of days.

§. 7. The Variety of ſeveral Nations in their fixing the beginning of their days is very great, as well as that of their Months and Years; but as to ſeveral of the Ancients this following Memorable *Diſtich*, gives ſome ſmall account of, *viz.*

Atticus occaſum ſpectat Babylonius ortum
Nox media Auſonii, media at Lux perplacet Umbris.

Thoſe that begin their day from Sun-ſet.

§. 8. Thoſe People indeed that have computed their days from Sun-ſet, are ſuch as have obſerved the courſe of the *Moon*; for in that time the Rule of the *Lunar Seaſons* appear in the *Starry Orb*, this they may perhaps have preferred to all others in imitation of *Moſes*, which there is no queſtion but by the *Jews*, *Arabians Athenians*, and other Eaſtern Countries as well as in *Africa*, was made uſe of.

From Sun-riſe.

§. 9. And this alſo was uſed by the *Babylonians*, *Chaldæans*, *Syrians* and *Perſians*, whom *Dionyſius Petavius*, *(b) Ptolomæus* and *Hypparchus*

(a) Lib. 9. p. 277. *(b)* L. 7. de Doct. Temp. p. 609.

follow-

following, accounted their beginning of their day from *Sun-riſe*.

§. 10. But the Cuſtom of Calculating the days from *Mid-night*, is chiefly aſcribed to the *Auſonians*, the moſt Antient Inhabitants of *Italy*, with whom it is very well known the *Romans* did agree for many years; and probably this may be the reaſon of its Inſtitution, becauſe that from that time wherein the Sun hath travers'd the lower part of the *Meridian*, it will then begin to riſe again; ſo that there might be a ſort of Harmony betwixt the beginning of the year and day, for of this *Ovid* thus ſpeaks. *From Mid-night.*

Principium capiunt Phœbus *&* *annus idem.*

Plutarch brings other Reaſons beſides this in his Problems, which may be ſeen in *Varro*, and from him in (*c*) *Aulus Gellius*.

§. 11. And the *Umbrians* (a People well known in *Italy*) near the *Appennine Mountains* and the *Adriatick Sea*, whom the *Greeks* ſuppoſed only to have ſurviv'd the General Inundation; whence their Name Ὀμβρίους, or *ſhowery* (as *Pliny* (*d*) and *Solinus* (*e*) would have their Original) uſually accounted their Day from *Noon*; with whom the *Hetruſcians* the Borderers on the aforeſaid *Appennine* Mountains, do agree. And becauſe the *Meridian* is a fixed immovable Circle (and eaſie for Obſervations) the Mathematicians have followed this Cuſtom two ſeveral Ways; ſome beginning their Days ſlower by 12 Hours, and others ſooner by the ſaid time, than the Civil; of the former ſort were *Tycho Braye* and his Followers; of the latter, *Alphonſus* and his Diſciples. *From Noon-tide.*

(*c*) Noct. Att. Lib. 3. c. 2. (*d*) Plin. l. 3. c. 14. (*e*) Cap. 8.

§. 12.

How by the Ægyptians.

§. 12. But many Authors of good Account disagree concerning the *Ægyptians*. *Alexander ab Alexandro* (*f*) says, that the *Ægyptians* and *Athenians* began their Day at *Sun-set*, which lasted to the same time next Day. Others there are, who have given out that the *Ægyptians* together with the *Chaldæans* began their Day from *Noon-tide*, whom *Christmannus* upon *Alfraganus* follows. *Pliny* (*g*) says that the *Ægyptians* computed their Civil Day from *Midnight* to *Midnight*. Nor are there wanting Arguments that will prove them to have begun their Day from *Noon*; which way *Ptolemy* frequently follows: But *Salmasius*, considering those Difficulties, makes use of this unheard of Solution: For he supposeth (*h*) the *Ægyptians* not to have had *Unequal Years, but Equal; and yet the Year consisted of* 365 *Days and a Quarter; which fourth Part or six Hours he supposes to be added every Year; whence it hapned, that if the first Year began at Midnight, the next began six Hours later, or in the Morning, the third at Mid-day, and the fourth at Sun-set: So that the first Day of every Year had not a certain, but fourfold Beginning in respect of the Hour.* But since this Opinion seems contrary to all other Authors, it is not to be relied on: And we shall still retain the same Opinion, that the *Ægyptians*, at least some of 'em, began their vulgar Year at *Sun-rise*.

How by the Ancient Gauls and Germans.

§. 13. The *Gauls* and ancient *Germans* seem but little to differ from the *Jewish* Custom about this matter, since these People observe the *Moon* in their Affairs, which *Tacitus* takes notice of, when writing of the *Germans*: *They assemble* (says he) *on certain Days, either upon a*

(*f*) Geneal. Dier. Lib. 4. l. 20. (*g*) L. 2. 77. (*h*) Exercit Plin. p. 552.

New

New or Full Moon, unleſs any thing accidental or unexpected falls out. And it is probable that thoſe Days began from Sun-ſetting, according to the Cuſtom of other People which obſerved the Moon's Motion; as *Tacitus* farther confirms; *For tranſacting Buſineſs, they believe this Juncture of Time the moſt auſpicious: Neither, do they reckon by Days as we do, but by Nights; and they ſo order and appoint things, as if the Night ſeem'd to uſher in the Day.* And *Cæſar* writes almoſt the ſame thing of the *Gauls*. This Cuſtom the *Engliſh* obſerve to this Day, which our Sennight, derived from SevenNight, and Fortnight from Fourteen Nights, doth confirm. But in *Bohemia* and Borders of *Poland* the ancient *German* Cuſtom is obſerved, where the Day is from Sun-ſet to the ſame time next Day; ſo that the Clock at Sun-ſet may be heard 24 times.

§. 14. The *Jewiſh* and *Political European* Time may be reduced to the *Mathematick*, beginning at Noon, if you ſubſtract from the *Jewiſh* 18 Hours, (for ſo many Hours the *Jewiſh* Computation anticipates the *Mathematical*, both in their Eccleſiaſtical and Civil Affairs;) a whole Day being added, if without it no Subſtraction can be made, the Remainder will ſhew the time ſought. But it our Political Time, beginning from Midnight, was to be compared with the Mathematical, there will be no need of Reduction, if in the Afternoon: But if in the Morning, add 12 to the given Hour, and ſubſtract 1 from the Number of Days, the Sum or Difference is the Mathematical time ſought.

How to reduce the Jewiſh *and* Civil *Day to the* Mathematical.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Of Months.

1. *A Month is that part of Time wherein we uſually divide a Year into* 12, *and ſometimes into* 13 *Parts.*
2. *Months are either Aſtronomical or Civil.*
3. *Aſtronomical are thoſe that depend on the motion of the Stars.*
4. *And becauſe we generally have reſpect to the Luminaries in ordering of 'em, ſome we call Lunar and others Solar.*
5. *A Lunar Month is that Space of time which is ſpent in the Revolution of the Moon through its proper Orb; or from a Synod to a Synod; and from the Appearance of the Moon after one Synod, to its Appearance again after another.*
6. *Hence Nature ſeems to produce a threefold Lunar Month, that is, a Synodical, Periodical and Month of Illumination.*
7. *The Lunar Periodical Month is that Space of time in which the Moon by her Motion returneth to the ſame Place of the Zodiack whence ſhe departed.*
8. *The Synodical is that Space of time from one Conjunction of the Luminaries till the next Conjunction following.*
9. *The Month of Illumination is that Space of time intercepted betwixt the firſt Day, whereon the Moon is ſeen after her Conjunction with the Sun, and the laſt Day of her being viſible.*
10. *The Solar Month is that Space of time wherein the Sun runs through one of the twelve Signs*

Signs of the Zodiack in its proper Motion.

II. *A Civil Month is a Syſtem of Days which different Nations differently obſerve in their Civil Affairs, as it beſt pleaſeth them.*

§. 1. AS to the *Etymology* of a Month it is obſervable that in almoſt every Language it is derived from the Moon, as among the *Hebrews* יֶרַח denoteth as well the Moon as a Month. Among the *Greeks* μὴν ſignifies the ſame thing. *Cicero* derives the *Latin* Word *Menſis* (*a*) from the Courſes of the Moon, ſince they make *Spaces* which the *German* Word *Monat* and our Word *Month*, both derived from the Moon, do likewiſe denote. *The Etymology of the Word.*

§. 2. From which it appears that the *Hebrews*, *Greeks*, *Latins*, and *Germans* obſerved the Courſe of the *Moon*: For although Arguments deduced from *Etymologies* of Words are but of little force; yet they are ſtrengthened if joined with other Proofs, eſpecially if we take notice of the extraordinary Aptneſs of the *Hebrew* Language and its Harmonical Communion with thoſe others mentioned before: whence *Julian* in that *Hymn* dedicated to the *King of Kings*, ſays, *That all the Months with all other Mortals are numbred from the Moon, ſave we only and the* Ægyptians, *who compute our Days of the Year by the Motion of the Sun.* Neither was the *Lunar Month* unknown long ſince to the *Romans*, tho' the *Apoſtate* excepts them, ſince that the true time in reſpect of Parturition; which with them was ten Months, ſeems to be the ſame with theſe: In which Senſe theſe Lines of *Ovid* are to be underſtood: *The Ancient Form of Months.*

Annus erat decimum cum Luna receperat Orbem,

(*a*) Lib. 2. de Nat. Deor.

Hic numerus magno tunc in honore fuit.
Seu quia tot digiti, per quos numerare ſolemus,
Seu quia bis quino fœmina menſe parit.

Of Myſtick Months.

§. 3. As to the *Myſtick* Months, conſiſting of 49 or 7 times 7 Days; although there can be no Nation ſo barbarous as wholly to lay aſide all Analogy with the Motion of the Heavenly Bodies, in appointing their Times; yet the Author of this *Myſtick Chronology* ſpares not to lay it on the *Jews* themſelves; and though theſe are fooliſhly aſſerted or rather fooliſhly feigned; yet is this Opinion maintained with great Abſurdities: For nothing can be ſo unreaſonable, as that God, who created the Luminaries for ſet-times, Years and Months, ſhould teach a People peculiar to himſelf any other thing. Neither is the fore-mentioned Word ירח derived from the Moon, of ſo late a Date. Beſide, who knows not that the *Jews* in the chief Feaſt of their Paſſover obſerve the Moon, and always celebrate the Feaſt on the *Full Moon*, and that on the 15th Day of the firſt Month. But ſuppoſe the *Jews* had their *Myſtical Month* conſiſting of 49 Days; yet this *Number* of *Days* have no Agreeableneſs with the Lunar Motion: So that inſtead of Full Moon, you will have nothing but mere Darkneſs. Nor do the Writers of the *Old Teſtament* oppoſe this Truth, who doubtleſs were ſacred and holy Perſons; and theſe ſpeaking of Sacred and Divine things, have made mention of the 8th and other Months beyond the 7th: So that if only this muſt be thought a *Myſtery* by reaſon of the Number 7, contrary to the Sentiments and Opinions of all Men; why did not this Myſtery-Expounder likewiſe ſurmiſe the ſame thing of a Day of 7 Hours, and of Hours of 7 Minutes, and ſo further on?

§. 4.

§. 4. We here again mention the *Periodical Month*, left due Conſideration ſhould be wanting as to its Uſe; whence *Kepler* calleth the *Periodical* Month the *Phyſicians Critical Month*; as to the Quantity of which, it is indeed unequal, and can be found no otherwiſe than by *Aſtronomical Calculation*, by which it will appear that its mean Motion is performed in 27 Days, 7 Hours, 43 Minutes, 5 Seconds. *Of a Periodical Month.*

§. 5. The *difference* between a *Periodical* and a *Synodical* Month, is, becauſe the firſt is called Periodical only in reſpect of the Moon's Orbit, but Synodical in reſpect of its Conjunction with the other Luminaries. And becauſe the Sun from the time of its Conjunction does not continue in the ſame Place of the *Zodiack*, but moves forwards towards the Eaſt, it cauſes, that the Moon finiſhing its Courſe does not find the Sun again in the ſame Point it left him; but is removed almoſt a whole Sign from its former Place; and that it might overtake the Sun again, it plainly appears that a certain Space of time is requiſite, beſides the Periodical, to make up the Synodical Month. *The difference of a Periodical and Synodical.*

§. 6. But as to the true Quantity of the *Synodical* Month, we are to gather it from *Aſtronomers*, who ſtudy its Motion; as *Chronologers* the Time in which the Motion is made; however, ſince a *Synodical* Month is apparently unequal, we ſhall content our ſelves with the enumerating from ſeveral Authors the mean Motion, as they call it; of which *Tycho Brahe's* we take to be the moſt Genuine: They are theſe; *Of a Synodical Month.*

	d.	h.	′	″	‴	⁗	⁗	⁗
1 *Cleoſtratus*	29	12	00	00	00	00	00	00
2 *Harpalus*,	29	12	50	54	33	00	00	00
3 *Eudoxus*,	29	12	43	38	11	00	00	00
4 *Cipparchus*,	29	12	44	03	15	44	39	04
5 *Calippus*,	29	12	44	12	45	57	26	49
6 *Metonis*,	29	12	41	26	48	30	38	18
7 *Ptolomy*,	29	12	44	31	20	00		
8 *Alphonſus*,	29	12	44	03	03	00		
9 *Tubul Prut*,	29	12	44	03	09	00		
10 *Tycho Brahe*,	29	12	44	03	09	00		

Synodical not always the ſame.

§. 7. The Quantity of a *Synodical* Month is not the ſame at all times; for in the *Summer Solſtice*, when the Sun ſeems to move ſloweſt the *Synodic Month* appeareth leſs, being about 29 Days, 6 Hours, and 42 Minutes: But in the *Winter*, when the Sun's *Motion* ſeems faſter, the *Moon* follows the *Sun* in a ſlower Space; for which reaſon the *Synodical Month* then ſeems greater, *viz.* 29 Days 19 Hours, and 37 Minutes, as ſome Aſtrologers do obſerve. So that what has been ſaid in the preceding Section about a *Synodical Month*, is to be underſtood as to the *mean* from which the true differs ſometimes 14 Hours; and ſo is either greater or leſs.

Of the Months Pleni and Cavi.

§. 8. Some Months we have called *Pleni* and others *Cavi*; the *Pleni* are thoſe that conſiſt of 31 Days, the *Cavi* of 30; and theſe two in the Lunar Year or Lunar-Solar, are placed alternately, by reaſon of the Dependence of the 12 Hours, which, if omitted in one Month, and doubled in another, make 24: For which reaſon they can be no longer neglected, but are to be compleated by the 30th Day, over and above the 29th.

§. 9.

§. 9. Some by the Month of *Illumination* will have that Space of time which is intercepted between the first and last Light of the *Moon*; which Acceptation of the thing, though it be otherwise well; yet since no such Month was ever used by any sort of People we know of, it is only here mentioned to serve the Curiosity of some. *Of the Months of Illumination.*

§. 10. Besides, the Lunar Month of *Illumination* is not of any certain *Quantity*, being sometimes seen sooner and sometimes later, as her Latitude is Northward or Southward, her Motion swifter or slower; or in *Signs* descending or ascending, right or oblique, as *Astrologers* have observed. *The Quantity of the same.*

§. 11. The *Arabians*, *Turks*, and indeed all that make use of the *Epocha* of *Hegira*, usually reckon their Month from the first *Phasis*, and observe no more in their Lunar Year, than that one New Moon come before another; and that left the Mirth of the Calends, which with them were solemn and sacred, because of the Eclipse or Suffering of the Sun, which might then happen, might be turned into Sadness: For which reason the *Turks* upon their Towers and Turbats always place a Crescent or Half Moon. And this some have asserted about the Ancient *Jews*; yet is not the Assertion approved of by all *Chronologers*; others supposing that the *Jews* most commonly made use of a *Lunar Calculation*, and at the same time to have attended only the Observation of the *Phasis*, not from thence that they might foretel the *New Moon*, but that they might sanctifie it, and receive the first Sight of the same, with this Prayer, *Be thou a good Omen to us and to all* Israel! As also that they might examine the Exactness of their Tables, and from them the Calculation sought for. *Of the* Turks *and* Arabians *their Year.*

The Custom of the Britains.

§. 12. As for the *Britains*, they anciently obſerved the *Phaſis* of the Moon; but when by reaſon of the great Winds and Clouds ariſing from the Ocean, the Moon's *Phaſis* could not be diſcerned, they followed a more certain Guide, the *Tydes*; according to the Ebbing and Flowing of which they do at this Day make great Account.

The Quantity of a Solar Month.

§. 13. As to the *Solar Month*, there is very great Inequality in it; becauſe the Sun in *Cancer* ſeems to us to move ſlower; for which reaſon the Month of the *Summer Solſtice* contains near 31 Days, 11 Hours and 36 Minutes; but in *Capricorn*, where the Motion of the Sun appears more ſwift, *Aſtronomers* account the Months of the Winter Solſtice only to conſiſt of 29 Days, 8 Hours and 54 Minutes, the mean *Quantity* therefore of every *Solar Month* will be 30 Days, 10 Hours and 15 Minutes, that is as long as the Sun is in the Equinoctial Signs.

Of Civil Months.

§. 14. The *Civil* or *Political* Months are threefold, either altogether uncertain, having no regard to the *Lunar* or *Solar Motions*, as thoſe of the *Ægyptians* in the Equal Year, of the *Romans* in the Year of *Romulus*, &c. or coming pretty near to the Solar *Aſtronomical* Months as the *Julian*, or the *Lunar Aſtronomical*, as the *Jewiſh*, *Turkiſh*, and others.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Of Years.

1. *Year is a certain ſpace of time, whoſe parts are commonly called Months.*

2. *And it is either Aſtronomical or Civil.*

3. *The Aſtronomical Year ſo called, is that whoſe quantity is ſo determined by the motion of the Heavenly Bodies, as neither the appendant Hours nor Minutes are omitted therein.*

4. *And becauſe it has peculiar reſpect to the Luminaries it is twofold, Solar and Lunar.*

5. *The Solar year, is that ſpace of time wherein the Sun by his proper Motion, departing from any one point of the Ecliptick, returns to the ſame again, and therefore it is either Tropical and Natural, or Sydereal.*

6. *The Tropical or Natural year, is the ſpace of time, in which the Sun departing from one of the Tropical, Equinoctial, or Solſtitial points, and running through the whole Ecliptick, returneth to the ſame point again, and it's Quantity is* 365d. 5h. 49'.

7. *The Solar Sydereal year, is the ſpace of time in which the Sun returns to the ſame Star from whence he departed, and it's Quantity as Aſtronomers tell us, is* 365d. 6h. 9'.

8. *That we call a Lunar year, (in ordering of which, reſpect is had to the Lunar Motions) is either common or emboliſmal.*

9. *The common Lunar year contains* 12 *Synodical Lunations, the extent of which is* 351d. 8h. 49'.

10. *The Lunar emboliſmal year contains* 13 *Lunar Aſtronomical Months, the Quantity of which is* 383d. 27h. 33'. *and this year is frequently uſed in the Lunar or Soli-Lunar Computation.*

11. *The Political or Civil years are those whose use is in Civil and Ecclesiastical Affairs, in appointing them as well as may be with respect to the Luminaries, but amongst the several sorts of Civil years, the* Julian *is the most celebrated, as we shall show in the Sequel of this Discourse.*

12. *And those sorts of years are either equal or mean, or true and unequal.*

13. *The mean or equal are those that always consist of* 365d. *and* 6h. *but are not in common use.*

14. *The true* Julian *years, are either common or Bissextile.*

15. *The common consists of* 365 *days and* 6h. *the Bissextile of* 366, *and such are all the years of Christ when divided by* 4 *into aliquot parts, according to that Distich.*

Tunc bissextus erit, partes per quatuor æquas
Annos partiri cum poteris Domini.

16. *But the Bissextile is a day arising from the* 4 *times* 6 *hours, which are omitted in the* Julian *years.*

The Etymology of the Word Annus.

§. 1. THis word *Annus* or *Year* in the 3 Ancient Languages, is derived as it were from a thing that goes round, or a *Circle*; for so much the *Hebrew* word שנה does signifie; and for the same reason in the *Greek* is it called ἐνιαυτὸς, and some will have it the word *Annus* is derived from the *Greek* ἀν *circum*, but it is a little absurd to derive the *Latin* from the *Greek*, and they are more in the right, who say that the word did formerly signifie a *Circle*; however, it is certain that *An* coupled, did signifie as much as *Circum*, as in the word *ambire*, to which the *Poet* doubtless alludes when he says,

In se sua per vestigia volvitur annus.

Or

Or it may be *Annus* from *Anguis* a *Snake*; for that the *Egyptians* before they had the use of Letters, represented it by a *Serpent* or *Snake* biting her Tail, which the *Poet* very well speaks of.

Est ignota procul, nostræque impervia menti,
Vix adeunda Deis annorum squalida mater,
Immensa spelunca ævi, quæ tempora vasto
Suppeditat, revocatq; sinu. Complectitur antrum
Omnia qui placido consumit Numine serpens,
Perpetuumq; viret squamis, caudamq; reducto
Ore vorat, tacito relegens exordia lapsu.

§. 2. But *Astronomical Years* do not depend wholly on the Luminaries, since by the Stars there could be no denomination of the year, and it is very certain that the *Saturnine* year is computed to 955 days, 12 hours, or almost 30 *Julian* years; and the *Astronomers* make the *Jovian* year to have 4331d. or almost 12 *Julian*; the year of *Mars* 687 days, or almost 2 years, but the years of *Venus* and *Mercury* as to their extent, differ not much from the *Solar Motion*. And the *fixed Stars* have also their *Periods*, though they move but very slowly, which is the reason a year of these according to *Hipparchus* and *Ptolomee* is equal to 36000 *Julian*; to *Alphonsus* 49000, to *Tycho Brahe* and *Kepler* 25806, and to *Longo-montanus* 26046, as *Riccivlus* (*a*) notes these and others opinions, and from him *Macrobius* observes (*b*) that a year is not only what we commonly call so, but the Stars as well as the Luminaries have their years, that is, a Motion from a certain place of the Heavens, to the same again. *Of Astronomical years.*

(*a*) Tom. 1. Almag. (*b*) In somn Scip. c. 11.

§. 3. The

Why also called Tropical.

§. 3. The *Tropical Astronomical* year of the Sun, is not so termed from the Solstices, as some of the Ancients were of opinion; but generally from the points of *Changings*, and the Suns double Motion; for many Authors shew that the *Equinoctials*, as well as *Solstitials* are called Tropicks, as *Manilius* (*c*), and *Sextus Empiricus* (*d*) in the Edition of *Stephanus*, do make appear.

Less than a Solar Sydereal.

§. 4. The *Solar Sydereal Year* is greater than the *Tropical*, because the fixed Stars use their own Motion, and whilst that the Sun performs it's course through the *Zodiack*, they move 50″ faster towards the *East*; therefore the Sun wants at least 21′ to be even with them, and by so much is a *Sydereal* year greater than a *Tropical*.

Solar Sydereal years, by whom used.

§. 5. Some will have it that the *Achaians* made use of this *Sydereal Solar Year*, which they began with the rise of the *Pleiades* or 7 Stars, and that the *Egyptians* nicely observed the rising of the *Sun* with the *Dog-Star*, as it appears from their Antient writings; yet it is owing more to fancy than any *Astronomical strictness*, to have respect to the *Sydereal Solar Conjunctions*, and that more in such an Age, wherein the slowest Motion of the fixed Stars was not sufficiently known.

§. 6. But the *Turks* and *Arabians* make use of the Lunar year some-what adapted to civil use, and the same custom is also observed in *Tartary*, *Siam*, *Japan*, *Peru*, and other places; and those that attribute this Custom to the *Gauls* and *Germans*, seem not mistaken, since *Bede*, who doubtless was well acquainted with our Ancestor's, their way of Computation, is very plain that they made use of the Lu-

(*c*) About the end of the 3. B. (*d*) L. 5 c. 1.

nar

nar year; these are his words, *Cum verò Emboliſmus, hoc eſt* 12. *menſium Lunarium annus occurreret, ſuperfluum menſem æſtati apponebant, ita ut tunc tres menſes LIDA vocarentur, & ob id annus ille* TRILIDI *cognominabatur.* Yet the Ancient Names of the *German Months* oppoſe this opinion, which as they are marks of the appointed Seaſons, ſo do they ſupply inſtances of a Solar year, *ſuch are Giuli, &c.* but ſome may ſay that theſe are later Names, and our Anceſtors only had 'em from the *Romans.*

§. 7. The *Lunar Year* has this inconvenience, that the ſame Months in ſeveral Lunar years, have not the ſame *Seaſon*, the occaſion of which is, that the Lunar year being leſs than the Solar by almoſt 11 days, in three years time every Month will have the *Seaſon* of that which went before it, and ſo further in ſucceſſion of time, *viz.* in 16 years thoſe Months which were in Summer, will be Winter, and *vice verſâ*, a thing the *Turks* who uſe this ſort of years, are very ſenſible of. *The Inconveniences of the Lunar year.*

§. 8. However the *Jews* who follow the Moons Motion in their Accounts, by intercalating an entire Month, retain ſtill the ſame Seaſons every Month, and as often as there is the difference of 30 days between the *Common Lunar*, and the *Solar Year*, they ſubſtitute an *Emboliſmal* Month called the *Veadar*, and hence it is that they have Lunar Months in the ſame *Seaſon*; and their year may not improperly be called *Lunæ-Solar.* *How the Jews appoint their Months, Years.*

§. 9. But *Kepler* ſays that the *Jews* after their departure out of *Egypt*, uſed only the *Solar year* ſo that, thereby he would make the *Lunar Solar Calendar* but of late date. His Deſcription of it is in the following words, *Patriarchas quidem aio, &c.* The *Patriarchs*, ſays he, made uſe of the *Egyptian* year of 365 *days*, divided into 12 *Months*, *Of their Calendar after their Departure out of* Egypt.

Months, 11 of which contained 30, and the 12th 35 days. But whereas the beginning of the *Egyptian* year went through all the Seasons of the year at their departure out of *Egypt*, it hapned in *Autumn*, whereas it should have hapned in the *Spring*; for which reason *Moses* commanded the Month of *first Fruits* to be made the first Month, by which the *Egyptian* movable year became fixed. But admit this to be true, it does not thence follow, that a Lunar was Established according to the *Egyptian* way; I know some Objections, but shall not take upon me the place of an Adversary. However this I confess, the *Jewish* year until the *Græcian Monarchy*, to have been *Solar*, not *Lunar*; and so he goes on further, *page* 91. with whom *Lydial* agrees in this opinion (Viz. *That the* Jewish *year always began about the N. Moon, and that all the other Months save the last, did consist of* 30 *days*. Now this is not worth contending for, for though it may well be supposed that the *Jews* after their Departure out of *Egypt*, did not leave their Ancient Solar Form of the years; for according to *Josephus*, *none of their Ancient rites as to their year were innovated*; yet however we cannot be perswaded but that their *Ecclesiastical* year from their departure out of *Egypt* to the time of the *Macedonians*, were purely *Solar*, without the least Regard to the *Lunar Motion*, since we find frequent mention made of it in the Holy Scriptures.

Of the Julian *year.*

§. 10. As to *Mystical Years*, since they are only the Off-spring of one Man's Brain, and never yet used by any sort of People, what we have said of *Months*, may indifferently be applyed to the *years* which are merely fictitious, and grounded neither on Holy or Prophane Writings, nor Revelation which the Author *Hainlinus* mostly seems vainly to value himself upon.

§. 11. But

§. 11. But *Chronologers* use the form of the *Julian year*, as a constant and acurate rule of their times, whence it happens that they do not only refer to the *Julian Calendar*, those things which came to pass after it's first Institution, but by way of *prolepsis*, make use of the same from the beginning of the *World*, nay, before the beginning it self; and that for 3 Reasons. 1*st*. Because this sort of year is universally known, and as equally fitted to the *Egyptian*, and *Nabonassarean* as other years. 2*ly*. That after the *Nabonassarean*, it is the most plain and easie of any. 3*dly*. Because the same Months in this year, have the same changes of the Seasons fixed, which and other like Reasons induced that famous Mathematician, *Kepler*, to lay aside the *Gregorian*, and make use of the *Julian* in his *Tables* of Heavenly Bodies; nay, and *Petavius*, tho' very much addicted to the *Gregorian Stile*, cannot but give the *Julian* this *Character*, *viz*, the *Julian year* (says he) *when fitted to use, is the most agreeable to the Nature of things, since that comes as near as can be to the course of the Sun, and is no less fit to Register the times, for which reason it is made use of in the Chronicles and Annals of most Writers, and that not only in recording of things since its Institution, but before nay from the beginning of the World it self. Wherefore for example sake when they would assign the Eclipses of the Sun or Moon, or the Wars of Cities and Kingdoms, and their famous Actions in their years and seasons, they always make use of the* Julian *Years and Months, as if they were then used by them, which by Anticipation and a sort of fiction they institute, by which ours will more easily agree with them, being fitted to the common times. Nor will the Reader be tired in observing the different sorts of years.* For *Petavius* saith that it is *the most exact Account of time, and easiest* *Of the* Julian *year.*

to

to be made uſe of, and which beyond all others is moſt fitted to common uſe, and cometh nearer to the Revolution of the Sun, than any other ſort of year whatever; and theſe and many other Reaſons there are, why the *Julian* year ſhould in general be explain'd, being likewiſe the Receptacle of all other *Epocha's*.

Of the Biſſextile.

§. 12. The Ancients did not add at the end of the year that whole day ariſing from the 4 times 6 hours, but to *February*, reckoning the 6 of the *Calends* of *March* twice over, yet ſtill accounting thoſe two *Days* for one, in which ſenſe *Celſus* (*c*) takes it. *For* (ſays he) *it matters not whether it be on the former or the latter days, ſince that thoſe are but accounted one*, which *Marcellinus* notes, was always thought by the *Romans* unfortunate.

The difference between a Solar Tropical and a Julian *year.*

§. 13. Since a *Julian* year is taken to be 365 days 6 hours, and the Solar Tropical mean years, according to *Longo-montanus*, to be 365d. 5h. 48′. 55″. it thence appears, that the difference of quantity between them following the ſaid *Longomontanus's Hypotheſis*, is but 11′. 5″. which *Chronologers* uſually call the *Civil Equinoctial Proceſſion*; and that becauſe in ſo much time the places of the *Equinox* do vary in the *Julian* year, by which means in the ſpace almoſt of 130 years, the *Equinoctial* and *Solſtitial* points ſeem to go backward a whole day.

Of the great Canicular year.

§. 14. As to the ſpace of time of the great *Canicular year*, which is called the *Stoick* or *Cynick* period, *Cenſorinus* gives us this account of it (*f*): *The Moon* (ſays he) *belongs not to the* Egyptian *year, which we call Canicular; becauſe it begins the firſt day of the Month they call the Thoth, when the Dog-Star ariſes.* For their Civil

(*c*) De Verb. ſig. L. 2. (*d*) De Die Nat. c. 18.

year

year has only 365 days, without any intercalatory day; therefore the ſpace of 4 years with them, is almoſt a day leſs than the Natural 4 years, by which it happens that in the year 1461. it revolves to the ſame place. This year is by ſome called Heliacal, as belonging to the Moon, and by others ὁ Θεῶ ἐνιαυτός.

§. 15. As the Heathens were deſtitute of the light of Scripture, and conſequently of the Original of the World, ſo they err ſtrangely about its end. The great year of *Plato* was a very notable fiction. The *Stoicks* as well as the *Platonicks*, thought that the World muſt have naturally an end, when all the Stars were again revolved to the ſame point; but what *Period* of years this *Revolution* may require, is not as yet known, even *Kepler* himſelf deſpairs of the *Poſſibility* of this invention, when he aſſerts that the Motion of the Stars are incommenſurable with themſelves. *Of* Plato's *great year.*

§. 16. Laſtly, as to *Ariſtotle*'s Greateſt year, ſome confound it with *Plato*'s great year, from which notwithſtanding it differs, which *Cenſorinus* further thus ſpeaks of: *There is* (ſays he) *another year, that* Ariſtotle *calls the greateſt, rather than the great, which the Spheres of the Planets conſtitute when they come together, to the ſame places where they were before*; the Winter of which made the Worlds Deluge, and its Summer will make the laſt Conflagration, &c. but *Marſilius* makes mention of another real year, in which the Soul of Man finiſhes its Circuit of *Tranſmigration*, which time they ſay is perform'd in 12000 years, to 3 of which years, the great year of the World is equal, conſiſting of 36000 years, wherein the *Anima Mundi* performs its Courſe; but *Peter* of *Aliacus* the *Cardinal* does otherwiſe determine the Quantity of the great year; for ſays he, as from the beginning *Of* Ariſtotle's *greateſt year.*

ginning of *Aries* to the end of *Virgo*, is equal to the half of that ſpace, which is from the beginning of *Libra*, to the end of *Piſces*; ſo ought there to be from the Birth of *Chriſt*, to the end of the *World*, as much time as was from *Adam*, or the *Creation* of the World, to the coming of our *Saviour*; this ſpace was 5260 years, therefore according to him from the beginning of the World to the end will be 10400, all the Stars finiſhing their Courſes, *&c.*

CHAP. VII.

Of the Epacts.

1. *Under the Name of* Epacts, *we uſually underſtand the Difference between a Lunar and* Julian *year.*

2. *The* Epacts *are either Civil or Aſtronomical.*

3. *The Civil* Epacts *are days intercepted between the common* Julian *year of* 365 *days, and the Lunar (taken at large) of* 354 *days, hence the Annual* Epacts *conſiſt of* 11 *days, except in every* 19 *year in which there are* 12.

4. *The Aſtronomical* Epacts *may be termed thoſe Days, Hours and Minutes, which are intercepted between the common Lunar year, and the mean or equal* Julian *year, which are* 10d. 12h. 11′. 22″. 16‴.

The Etymology of the Epacts. §. 1. THE word *Epact* is derived from the *Greek* ἐπάγω, which beſides other things, ſignifies to intercalate: In which ſenſe *Plutarch* in *Numa* uſes it; and in the *Egyptian Nabonaſſarean*

an Computation, the 5 days besides 12 Months, consisting of 30 days to compleat the year, are termed the ἡμέραι Ἐπαγωμεναι or *added days*, and therefore because the *Epacts* are days that are to be added to the *Lunar* year, this Denomination is no ways absurd.

The reason of the Epacts.

§. 2. The reason of the *Epacts*, is the difference of the quantity between the *Lunar* and *Julian* year; for the common is not *Equal*, but less than the *Julian*, but both are made use of in the *Ecclesiastical Account*; some Authors bethought themselves of reducing the one to the other, which they effected by appointing the *Epacts*.

The time when first known.

§. 3. A difference indeed was ever between the *Lunar* and *Julian* year; but because *Sosygenes* the Author of the *Julian Calendar*, in that form of a year he proposed *to Cæsar*, little regarded the Moons Motion; it is probable that the use of the *Epacts* was anciently unknown, and came in use with the *Cycle* of the *Moon*, in the time of *Dionysius*: therefore since the first year of the *Diocletian æra*, had the first *Cycle* of the Moon, and no such cause could be taken from the motion of the Moon, it may be supposed that the order of the *Lunar Cycle*, and consequently of the *Epacts*, may be deduced from the *Diocletian æra*; and after that to be taken, or rather the invention of *Meto*, *Calippus* and *Hipparchus*, being lost and obliterated, to have been used amongst the *Christians*.

How some Writers receive the same.

§. 4. There are some other Writers, who by the *Epacts* understand the difference between the *Lunar* and *Solar Tropical* year, and others between the true *Julian common*, and the *mean Lunar* year, in which sense *Joannes Baptista Ricciolus*, (*a*) takes them. In the *Rodolphin* Tables

(*a*) Almagisti Nov. part 1. l. 1. p. 241.

Epacts are calculated to be 10d. 15h. 11′. 21″. 49‴. 33⁗. in the *Prutanick* 10d. 15h. 11′. 21″. 52‴. 24⁗. but according to *Nicholas Mulerius* in the *Friſick Ptolomaick Table*, that time is ſuppoſed to be the *Epacts*, which is computed backward from the beginning of the year, to the next preceeding new Moon, which agrees to what before we have laid down.

Number of the Epacts. §. 5. The greateſt number of the common *Epacts* is 30, for as often as the number of the *Epacts* exceedeth this, ſo often is the whole *Emboliſmal* Month conſiſting of 30 days, always to be added to the *Lunar* year, ſo that it may be equal to the Solar or *Julian* year. And the 30 days of the Emboliſmæan Month, abſorbs this Addition, that in the Computation of *Epacts* they are not accounted for, as the Authors of this way have perſwaded themſelves and others. The Table of *Epacts* in this ourAge, is as follows.

Years.	Ep.	Years.	Ep.
1.	11.	11.	1.
2.	22.	12.	12.
3.	3.	13.	23.
4.	14.	14.	4.
5.	25.	15.	15.
6.	6.	16.	26.
7.	17.	17.	7.
8.	28.	18.	18.
9.	9.	19.	29.
10.	20.		

The Revolution of the Epacts. §. 6. The *Epacts* as the *Cycle* of the *Moon*, reſolve into themſelves again in 19 years, which being elaps'd, the Ancients were of opinion the *Cycle* of the *Epacts* were exactly performed, for which reaſon at the Numbers of this 19 years *Cycle*, they were wont to fix the *Epacts* of the

the Moon, as in the following Table; the meaning of which is thus. The Product of the Character of the *Cycle*, and 11 being divided by 30 the 3 *s.* being taken away, the remainder is the Product of the Moons *Cycle*.

Cycl.	☾.	Ep.	Cycl.	☾.	Ep.
	1.	8.		11.	28.
	2.	19.		12.	7.
	3.	0.		13.	20.
	4.	11.		14.	1.
	5.	22.		15.	12.
	6.	3.		16.	23.
	7.	14.		17.	4.
	8.	25.		18.	15.
	9.	6.		19.	26.
	10.	17.			

Of the Hours, &c. that remain beſides the Epacts.

§. 7. Since that an Account of the days in the common year cannot eaſily be had, therefore parts of days belonging to the *Lunar* and *Julian* years, although they are really unequal, yet in common uſe may be made equal one with another till that in the laſt year of the Lunar *Cycle*, they may be by the *Lunæ Saltus* laid aſide.

Of the meaning of the leap of the Moon.

§. 8. *Chronologers* make frequent mention of this *Saltus Lunæ* or the Moon-leap, in treating of the *Epacts*; this happens in the laſt year of every Cycle, by reaſon that in the ſpace of 19 years, the Exceſs of the *Julian* year above the Lunar is at large computed at 209 days, which being divided by 30, it gives 6 *Emboliſmal* Months; and 29 days will remain, which when the Cycle is reſolved into it ſelf, 30 days are taken inſtead of 29, or a 7th Emboliſmal Month, whence it follows inſtead of 11. in the Epacts we muſt uſe 12 in the 19th year; wherefore when the Epact of the laſt year exceeds one day by a *Metonymia*, they call it the Moon-leap, or *Lunæ Saltus*.

The Quantity of Aſtronomick Epacts.

§. 9. The Quantity of Aſtronomick *Epacts* may be thus known. The mean *Julian* Year being 365 Days, 6 Hours, and the *Lunar*, according to *Tycho Brahe's Hypotheſis*, 354 Days, 8 Hours, 48 Minutes 37″ 44‴. So that the difference will be 10 Days, 21 Hours, 11 Minutes, 22″, 16‴, which difference ought every Year to be ſubtracted from the *Julian* Year, that the mean *New Moons* and *Full Moons* may return to the ſame *Julian* Day again.

Reaſon of the Saltus Lunæ.

§. 10. The reaſon of the *Saltus Lunæ*, and the Uſe of the Number 12, inſtead of 11 in the Epacts in the laſt Year of the Cycle of the Moon, is becauſe the true Difference between 19 *Lunar*, and 19 *Julian* mean Years is 206 Days, 18 Hours, and almoſt 36 Minutes: So that if for every Year 11 Epacts were only uſed, there would happen 209 in 19 Years; and then the New Moons would change the Epacts 2 Days and more: Therefore to prevent this, an Emboliſmal or 30 Days Intercalation, which Aſtronomers define to be 29 Days, 12 Hours, 44 Minutes, 3″, 8‴, 39⁗, is always made uſe of, and ſo the Quantity of every *Emboliſmal* Month exceeds the *Aſtronomical* 11 Hours, 15 Minutes, and 57 Seconds; which multiplied by 7, is equal to 3 Days, 6 Hours, 5 Minutes, 39 Seconds; and theſe being added to the Difference between the 19 *Julian* and *Lunar* Years before determined, the ſame will make 210 Days, 1 Hour and almoſt 28 Minutes. Now, that the Epacts might attain to this Sum, 12 is aſſumed to the 19th Year: By which the Number of the Epacts is equal to 210 Days; and the difference is only one Hour and a few Minutes.

Of the Cyclic Defect.

§. 11. Yet although the Cyclic Defect of 1 Hour and a few Minutes may ſeem but

but ſmall, for which reaſon the Ancients took no further Notice of them; yet in the ſpace of near 312 Years they make an entire Day, whereby the New Moons get before the Epacts: Therefore in this our Age it is neceſſary the aforeſaid *Epacts* be augmented by 3, and they will ſerve us: Or if the Product of the Character of the Cycle of the Moon, and 11 be divided by 30 the Remainder (beſides the Quotient) will expreſs the Number of the *Epacts*, as is ſhewed in the Table hereafter.

The Uſe of the Epacts.

§. 12. The Uſe of *Epacts* is to ſhew in their Places, the Moon's Age, and chiefly the Full Moon before *Eaſter*, which is the Uſe the firſt Authors of the Epacts intended them for.

The difference of Epacts of the Old and N. Calendars.

§. 13. The difference of the *Epacts* of the Ancient *Calendars* from the New is as much as the Sum of Days taken away; whence Unites being ſubtracted from the Epacts of the old Calendar we have the Epacts of the New One.

How to know the Age of the Moon.

§. 14. And if *March*, or the Month that goes before *March* be named, the Sum of the Epacts or Days of the Month are ſaid to ſhew the Age of the Moon; but if that intended follow *March*, the Number of the Month from *March* may be added, and the 3 Min. as often as can be, left out; by which means the Age of the Moon every Month may be every Day known.

How to find Easter.

§. 15. If we would find in the old *Calendar* the 14th Moon or *Eaſter* from the *Epacts*, then the Sum of the Epacts being leſs than 26, muſt be ſubtracted from 47; if greater, or equal to 26, they muſt be ſubtracted from 46; the Remainder will ſhew the Day reckoned from the *Calends of March*, on which *Eaſter* ought to be aſſigned in the old *Calendar*.

Why the Epacts are called the Golden Number.

§. 16. The *Epacts* by ſhewing plainly the Age of the Moon, have obtained the Name of the *Golden Number*; but yet the *Warieſt Chronologers* are often miſtaken; who laying aſide the more tedious way, make uſe of this ſhort way, which ſhews the Errors both of the *Julian* and *Gregorian Stile.*

CHAP. VIII.

Of a Luſtrum, Sæculum, *or* Ævum.

1. *A* Luſtrum *is a certain Space of time anciently appointed for Civil Uſe; and tho' formerly it was reckoned to conſiſt of* 5 *Years, yet* Chronologers *do now repute it only as Four.*
2. *An* Ævum *is ſometimes taken for the Age of a Man, ſometime it denotes Infinite Duration.*
3. *A* Sæculum *is the Space of One Hundred Years.*

The Luſtrum *and its Uſe among the Ancients.*

Luſtrum (which ſignifies a purging by Sacrifice) is derived *à Luendo*, from paying or expiating: For in times paſt when the Sacrifices were performed; the Tributes were paid both by Capitation of the Men, till the time of *Conſtantine the Great* (as is now done amongſt the *Turks*) and alſo according to the Cuſtom of Taxing Acres of Land and other Goods. The Ancients alſo, as *Feſtus* remarks, were wont to lett out their (*a*) Farms for the Space of a *Luſtrum.*

(*a*) Vide Matth. Weſen. paratitla, ad dig. L. 1. Tit. de Cenſibus §. 2.

§. 2. The (*b*) Ancients unanimously assert, that *Lustration* amongst the *Romans* was the Duty of the Censors. These *Leased out the Publick Revenues, took care of the High-ways and publick Buildings, examined the Riches of every City, and inspected their Manners.*

Twas the Duty of the Censors to purifie (lustrare) *the People.*

§. 3. *Servius Tullius* Son-in-law of *Tarquinius Priscus*, introduced this Custom: For of him (*c*) *Livy* thus writes; *He instituted the Valuation of every Man's Estate; whence Taxes were laid not by Capitation of Men, as formerly; but according to their Estate.* In another Place (*d*) he ascribes to him the * *Suovetaurilia* or *Solitaurilia* (an Immolation of a whole Bull, a Ram and a Boar): *The Taxation of the Estate being made* (says *Livius*) *which he hastened by fear of the Law being made against those that avoided it; as also by Threatenings of Death and Imprisonment, all the* Roman *Horse and Foot appeared in* Centuries *in the Field of* Mars; *where, after Exercise, he* (lustravit) *purify'd the whole Army by the forementioned Sacrifice, whence this Action was called the* Lustrum, *being perfect at the finishing of the Taxation.*

The first Author of this Lustration was Servius Tullius.

* Solum *in the Language of the* Etrusci *signifies* whole.

§. 4. This Case is controverted amongst the Antiquaries: (*e*) Some will have it that the *Lustrum* amongst the *Latines* answers to the *Olympiads* amongst the *Greeks*, viz. a Space consisting of 5 Years from *Lustrum* to *Lustrum* inclusive; yet so as that every fourth Year being finish'd, reckoning the *Lustrum* one; on the beginning of the 5th a new *Lustrum* was performed; and on the 9th another, and so on: But (*f*) others

The Return of the Lustrum *amongst the* Romans *was every* 5 *Years.*

(*b*) Tit. Liv. *and his Epitomizer* Zonarus, Lib. 2. Vide Cic. de Leg. Lib. 3. Fran. Hotomannus de Magist. Rom. p. 107. (*c*) Liv. Lib. 1. C. 42. (*d*) C. 44. (*e*) Plin. L. 2. C. 47. G. Budæus in Pand ad L. &c. (*f*) Isid. Hispal. L. 5 C. 37. Erym. Barnab. Brison. de signific. verb. L. 10. Jos. Castal. Tab. Capit. Varro, Ovid. Hor.

of better Authority will have but one *Luſtrum* in five Years, reckoning the *Luſtrum* the laſt of the five. *Claudian* is very particular in this matter:

——— *Cum flaveſcentia centum*
Meſſibus æſtivæ detondens gargara falces,
Spectateſque iterum nulli celebrantia ludos
Circumflexa rapit centenus ſecula Conſul.
His annis, qui Luſtra mihi bis dena recenſent,
Noſtra ter Auguſtos inter pomœria vidi
Temporibus variis, &c.

But perhaps this difference amongſt Authors ariſes from the Change of the *Luſtrum*: For according to *Livy*, when *Æmilius* was Dictator, it was changed from 5 Years to one and a half. However, among all Chronologers at this time a *Luſtrum* is reputed conſtantly for the ſpace of four Years, which was the firſt Opinion.

There are two ſorts of Luſtrum, *the* Nebonaſſarean *and the* Julian.

§. 5. The *Luſtrum* of *Julian* and *Narbonaſſar* differ but one Day; the former conſiſts of 3 common Years and one *Biſſextile*, which makes 1461 Days; the other is made up of 4 common Years, or 1460 Days.

Ævum its Signification.

§. 6. The *Ævum* of the Ancients in its proper and received Signification paſs'd for the Age of one Man; and in thisSenſe 'tis uſed by the Nurſe in *Seneca's* Tragedies, diſſuading *Hippolytus* from a ſolitary Life:

Quam varia lethi genera mortalem trahunt,
Carpuntq; turbam; pontus, & ferrum, & doli.
Sed fata credas deeſſe? ſic atra ſtyga
Jam petimus ultro, cœlibem vitam probet
Sterilis juventus: hoc erit, quicquid vides,
Unius ævi turba, & in ſemet ruet.

: 7:

Other Significations of it amongst other Writers.

§. 7. Philoſophers uſe the Word *Ævum* to ſignifie Duration, or that which has a Beginning but no End; whence the Duration of finite Minds is commonly expreſſed by this Word. But *Cenſorinus* (*g*) makes no diſtinction betwixt *Ævum* and *Eternity*: *Ævum*, ſays he, is *tempus unum, &c. is one and the greateſt Time, immenſe without End, which always was, and ever ſhall be after the ſame manner; nor is any one concerned in it more than another*: And afterwards, *That which has no End cannot be compared with Meaſure: Wherefore I ſhall not endeavour to meaſure out an* Ævum *by any Number of Years, or Ages, or laſtly, by any Model of finite Time.*

Seculum, *its Signification.*

§. 8. *Cenſorinus* (*h*) reports, that Men had not agreed in his time about the Quantity of a *Seculum*. He diſtinguiſhes it into *Secula Naturalia* and *Secula Civilia*. The Natural he defines to be the longeſt Space of a Man's Life, which being variable and unequal, he firſt comments upon the manner of the *Etruſci*: *The Ritual Books of the* Etruſci (ſays he) *ſeem to teach us theſe* Naturalia Secula, *viz. They examined when any Town or City was founded, who at that time were born; from thence beginning their* Secula Naturalia; *the laſt of which dying, the* Seculum *expired: Again, of all that were lately born and alive at that time, he that lived the longeſt determined the ſecond* Seculum Naturale, *&c.* The *Seculum Civile* is the Space (*i*) of a hundred Years.

Why a Seculum *or the Age of Man is commonly reputed to be of* 100 *Years.*

§. 9. *Cenſorinus* relates this pleaſant Comment out of *Varro* and *Diſcorides*, that at *Alexandria*, where they were uſed to preſerve their Dead, they took notice of thoſe that died in their ful-

(*g*) De die natali. Cap. 16. (*h*) Lib. jam Citato (*i*) Varro de ling. Lat. Nov. 3. Albericum Gentilem de diverſis temp. appellationibus. Cap. 3.

full

Strength, and obſerved the Increaſe and Decreaſe of their Bodies, *viz.* in the firſt Year they encreaſed 2 Drams, the ſecond 4, and ſo on till 50 Years; and after the 50th Year they decreaſed again, each Year two Drams; till at the End of an hundred Years they returned to the ſame Weight.

CHAP. IX.

Of the Epocha, Æra, Cycle *and* Period.

1. *The* Epochæ *and* Æræ *are ſolemn remarkable Times, from which Men begin to reckon.*
2. *The* Cycle *and* Periods *are ſuch Spaces of time as revolve into themſelves again.*

The Derivation of the Word Epocha.

§. 1. AMong the *Greeks* ἐποχὴ ſignifies *inhibere, inſiſtere*, to *fix*, or *limit* a certain Point of time from whence all Men may reckon.

Of the Word Æra.

(*a*) Some will have it come from a vicious Punctation *A. ER. A.* i. e. *ANNUS ERAT AUGUSTI*; But it being anciently written *ERA* with a ſingle *E*, this Etymology may be rejected. (*b*) Others write it *Heram, ab Hero*, as firſt fixed from ſome great Man or Monarch. (*c*) Others will have *Æram, ab Ære*, from the Tribute-Money wherewith *Cæſar Auguſtus* taxed all the World, and ſtamp'd the World upon it, that in its Circulation it might carry a Symbol of Univerſal Subjection to the *Roman* Empire. Of the Antiquity of this Word

(*a*) Cordeb. Hiſpan. de anni emend. (*b*) Fabricius Paduan. in Catena temp. Annal. 41. (*c*) Iſidorus Lib. V. Etym. c. 36.

we

we have no tolerable Satisfaction but that it anciently was writ (*d*) *E R A*. *Antiquity of the Word Æra.*

There ought to be Characters ready at hand whereby an Epocha may be eſtabliſhed; elſe all Care will be fruitleſs: For ſince *Epocha's*, as *Scaliger* ſays, *are only Notations and Titles of Time: They ought to have proper and diſtinct Characters.* *Of the Care of a Chronologer in fixing and explaining an Epocha.*

§. 3. It comes from the *Greek* Word κύκλος, *Circulus*, a *Cycle*: or that which revolves it ſelf again. Thus there are Horary, Diurnal, Lunar, Solar, Secular Cycles, *&c.* as hereafter. Cycle, *its derivation and Multiplicity*

§. 4. We almoſt underſtand the ſame by a Period as by a Cycle, only here; a Period once ended, never begins again; tho' a Cycle continually begins again after its Revolution. When *Cycle*, *Æra* or *Epocha* is loſt and never revived, the Determination is a *Period*: Therefore it differs from an *Epocha* and *Era* in this; 'tis *Terminus ad quem*: they, *Termini à quo*. *A Period is different from a Cycle, Epocha or Era.*

(*d*) In *Cipſtia Hiſpanicis* legitur ERA, ut per Inſcript. *Nebriſſa* patet. Etiam eandem vocis notationem haberi in Concilii Carthaginienſis & Toletani Libris.

The End of the Firſt Book.

OF

OF
Chronological Characters,

BOOK II.

CHAP. I.

Of Chronological Characters in general.

1. Chronological Characters *are the Principles from which we ſhew.*
2. *Theſe Characters are either Aſtronomical or not Aſtronomical.*
3. Aſtronomical Characters *are thoſe which are taken from the Stars meaſuring time by their Motion, and are made uſe of to decide Chronological Controverſies, ſuch are chiefly the* Æquinoxes, *the* Solſtices, *the* New Moons, *the* Lunar Phaſes, *the* Eclipſes of the Sun and Moon, *the* Conjunction of the Planets, either with the fixed Stars, or betwixt themſelves; *and others of the like Nature.*
4. *Thoſe Characters which are not Aſtronomical, are ſuch as owe their Original either to the Will of God or Man, and determine either Days or Years. Of which we ſhall ſpeak in order hereafter.*

§. 1.

§. 1. THAT Chronology does not want its certain Principles is evident, if we conſider thoſe Characters, which in part we have named; and which hereafter we ſhall explain: Nor is the Suffrages of Witneſſes in this Affair inconſiderable: For well, as St. (a) *Auguſtine* ſaid, I am equally certain of the Building of *Rome* and *Conſtantinople*. *For what if I have ſeen* Rome *with my Eyes, I know nothing of it but what I believed from other Witneſſes.* Therefore Chronology in this part is like other Sciences, in which the Concluſion is not believed except it be firmly proved or demonſtrated. But if from Authority only without any Character or other neceſſary Connection of Years, a Series of time ſhall be laid down how the whole begins to be but Opinion, and has nothing in it to uphold a firm Perſwaſion. But *Chronological* Principles differ from *Phyſical* ones in this; the former relate to *Knowing*, the latter to *Being*. *Whether there are any, and what ſort of Principles in Chronology.*

§. 2. When we argue from one Science to another, where the Objects are different in *toto genere*; this is a Fault: but whereas Chronology is ſubalternate and dependant upon Aſtronomy; and has its Object contain'd under the Object of Aſtronomy, 'tis no Error, any more than for an Architect to uſe Geometry, or a Muſician Arithmetick. *A Chronologer proving his Concluſions from Aſtronomical Principles does not amiſs.*

§. 3. Aſtronomical Characters are not made uſe of in Chronology as Concluſions, but as firſt Principles; then there is no need of demonſtrating them: Wherefore we think they act preposterouſly who gives in their Chronological Writings whole Theories, and thoſe of the Sun, Moon and fixed *Aſtronomical Characters cannot be conveniently uſed in Chronology to conſider* Why *A*ſting is but only that it is.

(a) Lib. 3 de Civ. Dei, Cap. 3.

Stars

Stars, which *Petavius* (c) has also done in a very prolix Work: whereas the Knowledge of Astronomy is supposed or taken for granted by a Chronologer.

Not only the mean times the Æquinoxes, Solstices, and Coniunctions of the Luminaries, but also the true, is necessary to be known by a Chronologer.

§. 3. It may sometimes happen the *Æquinoxes Solstices*, also the mean *New* and *Full Moons* may fall upon another Day, as the *true* may; but whereas to find out the true Places of the Luminaries require a more prolix Calculation, let the Chronologer consult the Astronomer: But whereas such Alteration seldom happens, he may, being not perfect in Astronomy, be content with the Knowledge of the mean Motions.

Other Astronomical Characters besides what are laid down, may be assigned.

§. 4. The Conjunction of the Planets, their mutual Aspect, their Ingress into other Points of the Zodiack, besides the Cardinal ones, with other Characters yet less frequent, may be made use of in *Chronological Concerns.*

(c) De Doctrina temp. lib. 8. De veris & accuratis Solis ac Lunæ motibus & amborum deliquiis agitur, à pag. 696. usq; pag. 886.

CHAP. II.

Of the Hebdomatic *or* Weekly Character.

1. *The Weekly Character is that whereby we distinguish one Day of the Week from another.*
2. *The Week is a System of 7 Days continually recurring; and to this end divinely ordained, That the Memory of the six Days Creation might be preserved, that the seventh might be kept holy, and that Man and Beast might rest.*

3.

3. *One Denomination of the Days of the Week: is vulgar, owing its Original to Gentilism, Another Chronological, repeating the Order of the Days in the Week.*
4. *In common Use the Days of the Week are denominated from the Planets in this Order: The first from the* Sun, *the second from the Moon, the third from* Mars, &c.
5. *The Chronological Denomination of the Days of the Week is disposed in Order; as, the first Day is called* Feria prima, *the second,* Feria secunda, *&c.*

The Observation of the 7th Day or the Hebdomatic Character was in use from the Creation of the World.

§. 1. AT the Creation, the 7th Day was sanctified; and from hence Men, to whom that Law was given, ought to continue it so, since that Sanction was made only (*a*) because of Man; but upon the 7th Day of the Creation this Sanction was made; from thence there is derived the Remarkableness of this Character, add to this the Mention of the Sabbath in Scripture as a noted thing, even before the (*b*) Law was made; which without doubt, the Author of the Epistle to the (*d*) *Heb.* refers, asserting that eternal Rest which God had prepar'd for his Children; not only by the Possession of the *Holy Land*, but also by that Sabbath which was prefigured from the Original of the World: Some also will refer to this that Passage of (*d*) *Noah*; who in the time of the Flood sent not out the Birds till after the 7th Day to try whether the Waters were abated; which Argument sufficiently restrains and fixes the Sanction upon the 7th Day, as a positive and moral Duty upon Men, notwithstanding the Objections of

(*a*) Mark 2. 27. (*b*) Exod. 16. 26. (*c*) Chap. 6. 3. (*d*) Gen. 8. 11.

(*c*)

(e) some againſt it, who would have the Sabbath take its Original from the raining of *Manna* in the Wilderneſs.

The Order of the (Feriæ) *or Days in the Week, has been preſerv'd always incorrupt till our times.*

§. 2. All Chronologers who admit the Antiquity of the Hebdomatic Cycle, always look upon the Order of the Days of the Week to have been the ſame; ſo that to deny it, would be to call in doubt one of the firſt Principles in Chronology.

Why all the Days in the Week are now called Feriæ.

§. 3. (f) Some will have it, that the *Roman* Church, whom all Chronologers follow, called every Day in the Week *Feria*; *Feria* 1*ma*, *Feria* 2*da*, &c. becauſe the old Eccleſiaſtical Year began from the *Paſca*, and the *Paſca* was called *Annus novus*, as now in the Church of *Antioch*; and for the ſame reaſon in that of *Conſtantinople*, διαπανίσιμον ἑβδομάς; but all the Days of the Paſcal Week were called *feriati*, as St. *Jerome* and other Ancients witneſs: And hence it obtain'd for the Days of the other Weeks to be called *Feriæ*, in imitation of that. Some ſay, we follow the Cuſtom of the *Jews* in this Reckoning; of which hereafter: But *Toſtatus*, and after him, *Corn. à Lapide*, that the Church by the Inſtitution of Pope *Sylveſter*, called all the Days of the Week *Feriæ*; Firſt, becauſe every Day in the Week ought to be a Holy-day to a Chriſtian: Secondly, That ſo far as related to Eccleſiaſtic Offices; and the Miniſters of the Church, thoſe Days are really *Feriæ* or *Feſta*, Holidays; and every thing is to be reſted from but Divine Worſhip.

§. 4. We cannot ſeek for the Derivation of this Word *Sabbath* among the *Greeks*, as *Plutarch* has done from Σαβάζιος, a Name of Revellers; nor among the *Ægyptians à Sabbo*, a Word

(e) Rob. Loeum. Tomarus. Rivetus. (f) Joſeph. Scaliger Lib. de Emend. Temp. p. 8.

ſigni-

signifying a Diſeaſe in the Groin; but 'tis derived from the *Hebrew* Word שבת which ſignifies Reſt, as referred to the Inſtitution of God, when after ſix Days Creation he reſted upon the 7th. (g) *Cornelius Tacitus* being ignorant of this *Jewiſh* Cuſtom, has invented ſeveral Fables about the Original of the Word; which may be peruſed by any one that thinks it worth his Pains.

§. 5. In times paſt they did not only call the 7th Day of the Week the Sabbath; but from this very Day all the Days of the Week received their Denominations; as, our Sunday they called the *one* or *firſt* (h) Day after the Sabbath, our Monday the *ſecond* Day after the Sabbath, Tueſday the *third*, and ſo on: that by the Word *Sabbath* they ſometimes meant the whole Week, is evident from that Paſſage of the proud Phariſee (i) Νηστεύω δὶς τοῦ Σαββάτου, *I faſt twice in the Week.* On the contrary, for the Word *Week* the Ancients wou'd ſometimes uſe the Term *Sabbath*, as in this Paſſage; (k) ἄγειν τὴν ἑβδομάδα ſignifies no more than *to keep the Sabbath.*

What it is we ought to underſtand about the uſe and ſignification of the Word Sabbath.

§. 6. Amongſt divers Opinions about it, that of *Scaliger* ſeems to be moſt reaſonable, and has been approved of by *B. Schmidius*, *Langius*, and others, *viz.* πρῶτον σάββατον μετὰ τὴν δευτέραν τῶν Ἀζύμων, *Hebraicè* שבת ראשון ממחרת *the firſt Sabbath after the ſecond of the Days of unleavened Bread:* Upon which there was Oblation of Fruits, and from whence ſeven Weeks (l) were reckoned till *Pentecoſt*: and therefore the Sabbaths betwixt the *Paſca* and *Pentecoſt* were thus named:

What we are to underſtand of the Sabbatum δευτερόπρωτον.

(g) Lib. 5. (h) Matth. 28. 1. 1 Cor. 16. 2. Mark 16. 9. (i) Luke 22. 12. (k) 2 Maccab. 6. 11. (l) Lev. 18. 15.

The *Saturdays* before

Δευτέρα πρωτον	*Quaſi modo geniti.*
Δευτέρα δεύτερον	*Miſericordias Domini.*
Δευτέρα τρίτον	*Jubilate.*
Δευτέρα τέταρτον	*Cantate.*
Δευτέρα πεμπτον	*Vocem jucunditatis.*
Δευτέρα ἕκτον	*Exaudi.*
Δευτέρα ἑβδομον	*Pentecoſten.*

Of the Sabbatic River which the Jews were wont to alledge in Teſtimony of the Sabbath, which was ſanctified by God.

§. 7. After many other Fabuliſts, *Menaſſeh Ben Iſrael* (*m*) writes, that *the Sabbatic River is a Teſtimony of the Sabbath ſanctified by God, whereof mention is made in the* Babylonian *and the* Jewiſh Talmud: Rabat, Jalcut, *and* Joſephus *alſo an Hiſtoriographer of great Authority, makes mention of it as running through* Phœnicia *in* Aſſyria; *which after ſix Days of its own Accord ſtops its rapid Courſe, and afterwards runs after the ſame manner; and therefore it received the Name of the* Sabbatic River, *from its Reſt on the ſeventh Day. Others* (n) *will have it, that this River is* Gozen, *over which the ten Tribes paſs'd, and at the Coming of the* Meſſiah *they ſhall be freed from their Captivity; and according to the Ancient Wiſemen* (*o*) Iſaiah *ſpeaks of the People beyond this River, which is commonly called* Flumen Lapidum. But theſe are childiſh Fables of the *Jews*: For the above-mentioned *Joſephus* ſays, *This River runs very ſwift on the Sabbath Day.* Theſe are Rivers that run only out of the Brains of the *Rabbi's*, which are near a-kin to the Poets.

(*m*) In Concil. Quæſt. 36. in Exodum. (*n*) R. Moſes Gerundinenſis. (*o*) Cap. 48. 9.

§. 8.

§. 8. (p) Not only among the Gentiles accuſtomed to Superſtition, was the Number 7 had in great repute, but alſo amongſt the Chriſtians many wonderful things are ſpoken of the myſterious Character 7. Nor has *Auguſtine* (q) eſcaped the Prejudice, who makes 7 of 3 and 4 a very perfect Number. *The firſt of theſe* (viz. 3.) ſays he, *is wholly odd, and denotes Excellency; the other is perfectly equal, and denotes the Mother of Juſtice, Equability and a ſacred Agreement in things. This Number 7 is alſo aſſum'd into the moſt ſacred Myſteries, is concerned in the Formation of Corporeal Things, and appears a Symbol of Perfection.* Others, as *Philo*, *Robertus Pontanus*, &c. reckon up thoſe things wherein the Number 7 is concerned; as almoſt all Sacrifices were offered by ſevens, as 7 Bullocks, 7 Rams, which always was obſerved by that mercenary (r) Prophet *Balaam*. Nor do we want Examples of it among the Gentiles, as in that Paſſage of the Poet;

What we ought to judge of the Numb. 7, which determines the Cycle of the Feriæ.

Nam grege de intacto ſeptem mactare juvencos
Præſtiterit totidem lectos de more bidentes.

And thoſe who reckon up the Myſteries of the Number 7, tell us, that the chief Feaſts of the *Jews* were reckoned to 7 Months of the Year, and continued 7 Days, *in the* Paſca *they the unleavened Bread 7 days and then they reckoned 7 Weeks to the* Pentecoſt; *many joyful Days were celebrated in the 7th Month. Wiſdom built her Houſe upon 7 Pillars: In the Lamp of the Sanctuary there were 7 Candles:* St. John *in the* Revelations *ſaw 7 Golden Candleſticks; and in* Zachary *a Stone had 7 Eyes: In the New Teſta-*

(p) Photius in Excerptis ad Nichom. (q) Lib. 5. Quæſt. ſuper Deut. & Lib. 2. de Cive Dei cap. 21. (r) Numb. 23. 1.

ment there were 7 Deacons chosen; and through the whole Apocalypse *of St.* John *the different State of the Church is described by the Number 7: Christ commands him to write to the 7 Churches of* Asia, *and their 7 Angels: The mystical Book was sealed with 7 Seals: 7 Angels with 7 Trumpets and 7 Vials represented the State of the Church in the last Days.* They yet add to these in Natural things, that there are 7 *Planets*, 7 fixed Stars called the *Pleiades*, the 7 *Hyades*; and both the Bears are figured with 7 Stars. There are 7 habitable Climates in the Earth: The Structure of the Humane Body is 7 Feet: And innumerable other things are wont to be alledged by (*f*) those who seek Mysteries in the Number 7.

The naming of Days in Weeks is not the same now among the Jews *and* Christians *as it was at first.*

§. 9. In Section the 3d and 4th of this Chapter we have given an Account of the Denomination of the Days in the Week among the *Jews*; and in §. 3d. Ch. 2d. of the accounting by *Feriæ*, among the *Romans* and Eastern Christians: But now we all use the Names of the Planets in the Days of the Week.

The reason why the same order of the Planets in naming the Days of the Week was not observed among the Ancients.

§. 10. The Order of the Planets, if you consider their Spheres or Orbs, is express'd by this memorable Versicle:

Post SIMSUM sequitur, ultima LUNA subest.

But there's nothing attended to less than this in the Names of the Days of the Week. *Dio* (*t*) *Cassius* gives us the reason and Original of this, which, he that pleases may read at length, and understand upon what Grounds they

(*f*) Vide Philonem passim in suis Scriptis. Roberti Loci Angli Effigiationem veri sublati. p. 25. Meursii denarium Pythagoricum, &c. (*t*) Lib. 37. Hist. Rom.

first

firſt fixed the Muſick of the 7 Spheres, and how they would have the Days of the Week concerned in it. The Cuſtom of the *Egyptians* in theſe muſical Proportions (tho' known every where) was formerly unknown to the Ancient *Greeks*; therefore each had their diſtinct Way.

Of theſe Days of the Week which among divers People have been kept holy.

§. 10. In ancient times the 7th Day of the Week was kept holy; which Cuſtom owing its Original to the Divine Inſtitution, the *Jews* at this time obſerve; but the Chriſtians have receded from it, diſtinguiſhing themſelves in this matter from the *Jews*, conſecrating the firſt Day of the Week to Divine Worſhip; And Examples of this Worſhip ſeem to be fetch'd even from the time of the (*u*) Apoſtles. Certainly, except Chriſtians could alledge Apoſtolick Tradition, they would ſcarce with ſo much Religion and Conſtancy have obſerved the firſt *Feria* or *Sunday*: That *Melito* a Coemporary of *Juſtin* would have wrote a whole Book upon that Matter; that whole Companies of the Faithful would have incurr'd the Suſpicion of the Idolatrous Worſhip on Sunday; that they would even with their Blood (*w*) teſtifie their Sanction of that Day: For the Martyrs being asked, (*x*) *Haſt thou kept the Lord's-day?* anſwered, *I am a Chriſtian and cannot paſs it by.* The *Africans* in *Guinea* obſerve *Wedneſday*, which they call *Dio Fetiſſos*, and abſtain from their accuſtomed Labours on that Day. The *Turks* every Year obſerve *Friday*, either from the Command of *Mahomet*, or from an ancient idolatrous Cuſtom brought from the *Indians* to the *Arabians*; on which thoſe Worſhip their chief Deity, called

(*u*) John 20. 19, 26. Acts 15. alſo 20. 7. 1 Cor. 16. 1 and 2.
(*w*) Tertul. Apol. Cap. 16. (*x*) D. Danhov. diſp. dec. oct. §. 5.

Venerem CHOBAR, of which Worſhip *Jerome* takes notice in the Life of *Hilarius*, in theſe Words; *He came to* Eluſa, ſays he, *by chance on that Day, where the Anniverſary had occaſioned a Concourſe of the People of the Town in the Temple of* Venus: *For they worſhip her before* Lucifer; *to whoſe Worſhip the whole Nation of* Saracens *is devoted.*

The Reaſon why all Julian Years begin not on the ſame Day.

§. 11. A Common Year, for Example, being ended, which begins upon one Day, the ſecond Year begins not upon the ſame, but the next Day after: And if that ſhould happen to be a *Biſſextile*, the ſecond Year would have begun on the third Day after; the reaſon of which from the Quantity of our Year is evident: For the Common Year having 365 Days in it, or 52 Weeks and one Day over, and the Biſſextile 2 Days over and above the 52 Weeks, divide either 365 or 366 by 7, (the Days in one Week: ſo that if the Year begins on a *Monday*, the laſt Day in the Year will be on a *Monday*, and then the firſt Day of the next Year muſt be *Tueſday*.

What 'tis we underſtand by Roman Nundinæ.

§. 12. Whoever will give himſelf the Trouble of inſpecting fully into this matter, may peruſe (*y*) *Macrob.* which in ſhort is this; That upon the 8th Day, (not the 7th) they met in the Fields to ſacrifice for the Dead, and conſult the Country-Affairs, and promulgate Laws that were eſtabliſh'd; and afterwards upon the ninth Day they conſulted about Trade and City-Affairs; and theſe Concourſes of People were called *Nundinæ*: Some ſay they were inſtituted by *Romulus*: Others by *Servius Tullius*.

(*y*) Lib. Saturn' Cap. 16. Vide etiam Fred. Taubmannum.

§. 13.

§. 13. Among other Praises of *Constantine the Great*, this is not the least: That on the Lord's Days or Sundays, he commanded the Gentile Legions to pray: For thus (z) *Eusebius*; *When he had taught all his Soldiers to sanctifie this Day of Salvation, which we call the* Day of Light *or* Sunday, *he gave leisure to those, who by Divine Instinct, believed that they should freely frequent the Church of God, and pray unto him without Molestation: And others, who had not yet been sensible of the Divine Doctrine, he commanded by another Law, That on Sundays they should go out into the Fields of the Suburbs, and there use all together the same Form of Prayer upon a Signal given.*

Of the time the Roman Nundinæ *were abrogated, and the* Feriæ primæ *substituted in their room.*

CHAP. III.

Of the lesser Sacred Annual Character or the Sabbatic Cycle.

1. *The Sabbatic Cycle is a System of 7 Lunæ-solar Years continually returning, instituted by God for this reason, That the Earth and Men might have their Vicissitudes.*

§. 1. THE Sabbatic Years are of Divine Institution, as may be seen at large *Lev.* 25. 2. where the Earth and the Vines were to be plough'd and gathered for 6 Years, and the 7th Year to rest and not be cultivated. See also *Exod.* 23. 11. The beginning of the Sabbatic Cycle was the 7th inclusive from the

(z) Lib. 4. de Vita Constant. M. Cap. 19.

time, when the Diviſion of the Land (into which the *Iſraelites* were then about to enter) was to be made by (*a*) Lot. If this be obſerved, all the Sabbatic Years will doubtleſs be rightly fixed, and no Errors about it can happen; if not, we have no certain Character can be aſſigned us to proceed upon.

Of thoſe Years that are certainly Sabbatic.

§. 2. *Calviſius*, (*b*) when other Authors diſagree among themſelves, has fixt theſe. The 15th Year of the Reign of *Hezekiah* (*c*) King of *Juda*, was Sabbatic: The Year in which *Antiochus Eupater* (*d*) beſieged *Jeruſalem*, was Sabbatic: The Year in which *Simon Maccabæus* was ſlain by (*e*) *Ptolemy* was Sabbatic: The Year of the Captivity of *Jeruſalem* by *Herod* (*f*) was Sabbatic: The Year before the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem* (*g*) by *Titus Veſpaſian*, was Sabbatic: The Year of Chriſt, 1189 was (*h*) Sabbatic: The Year of Chriſt 1602 was (*i*) Sabbatic. Beſides theſe of *Calviſius*, others might doubtleſs be fixt.

Their Opinion muſt be falſe who aſſert that by the Divine Command the Sabbatic Cycle was in uſe among the Jews before the diſtribution of their Land by Lot.

§. 3. There are (*k*) ſome who tell us, that the firſt Sabbatic Year of the Law was that in which the *Iſraelites* being brought by *Moſes* to the Borders of *Jewry* and Land of *Canaan*, a little after the Death of *Moſes* began to enter and poſſeſs it under their Captain *Joſhua*: So that they will have this Cycle to begin 7 before what is aſſigned by *Scaliger*, *Calviſius*, and before theſe *Euſebius*. But this agrees not with the Divine Precept; For the *Jews* at that time did not enter into the Land of *Canaan*; For altho' the Tribes of *Reuben*, *Gad*, and ½ of *Manaſſes* received the Kingdom of *Sihon* and *Baſhan*

(*a*) Exod. 46. (*b*) Iſag. Chron. c. 25. (*c*) 2 Kings 19. 29. (*d*) Macc. 6. 49. (*e*) Joſephus l. 4. c. 28. (*f*) Ibid. (*g*) Ibid. (*h*) Matt. Pariſ. (*i*) Judæorum Calend. (*k*) Lauren. Codomont. l. 2. Chron. Quæſt. 40. & temp. l. 3. Chron. Dem. p. 103. Chronol. myſt. in ſole temp. p. 22.

from *Moſes*; yet it was not to theſe only, but the whole People that the Divine Command was given: Nor was the Land on this ſide *Jordan* properly called (*l*) *Canaan*: Nor did the Tribes inhabit it to whom it was aſſigned: For theſe ought, with the reſt of the (*m*) Tribes, to paſs over *Jordan*, from whence, after many Years they (*n*) returned again. Add to theſe things, That *Moſes* in *Deuteronomy*, which Book he propoſed to the People only one (*o*) Month, before his Death ſpeaks of the Land of Promiſe, not as yet poſſeſt, but to be poſſeſt. *Deut.* 6. 10. *But when the Lord thy God ſhall bring thee into the Land*, &c. Therefore it can't be ſaid *Iſrael* was entred into the Promiſed Land, to wit, *Canaan*, before the Death of *Moſes*.

Whether we are to think that the Sabbatic Cycle was analogous to the Hebdomadic, and conſequently whether it can be of the ſame uſe in determining the firſt Year of the World.

§. 4. Although by what precedes, it is certain that the Hiſtorical Beginning of the Sabbatic Cycle is to be derived from the Diſtribution of the Land by Lot, yet we ſhall not reject their Opinion, who think that God in ordaining this Cycle had reſpect to the Sabbath of Days; and that therefore the firſt Day of the World was alſo the firſt in the Sabbatic Year; as the firſt Day of Creation was the firſt in the Hebdomadic Cycle. For this Opinion ſeems not improbable, when the Reaſon of this Cycle was not leſs univerſal than that of the Diurnal Hebdomadic Cycle. Therefore the Opinion of *Rob. Pontanus Caledonius* a *Britain*, does not diſpleaſe us, when he aſſerts as much, ſaying, (*p*) *That the Reaſon of this ſacred Obſervation proceeding by ſevens, has its Foundation in the Law of Nature, as the Example of God himſelf,*

(*l*) Numb. 32. 29, 30. 31, and 32. alſo 33. 51. alſo 35. 14. (*m*) Ibid. (*n*) Joſh. 22. 3, and 4. (*o*) Cap. 1. 3. (*p*) De Sabbaticorum Annorum Period. c. 2. p. 13.

which

which precedes all Laws, from whence we may fairly gather, that this Reason of reckoning by Sabbaths has respect to the Original of the Word, and by a continual Series to be deduced from the first Sabbath: That as God himself rested from the Work of Creation on the 7th Day, so those Years of Rest, (Sabbaths *and* Jubile's) *came from the same exemplary Principle.*

The Sabbatic Cycle is a Character of certain and indubitable credit in respect of Time.

§. 5. Some of the *Jewish* (*q*) *Rabbi's* seem to derogate from the Certainty of this Character when they tell us, *The Israelites had reckoned* 17 Jubile's *from the time they went into the Land of* Canaan, *till the time they went out of it again. And the Year in which they went out, when the first Temple was destroyed, was at the end of a seventh Year, and the* 36*th of a* Jubile. *For the first Temple stood* 410 *Years; and after it was destroyed, this Computation was also lost and abolished; from thence the Land lay desart* 70 *Years, and the* 2*d Temple was built, which stood* 420 *Years: And in the* 7*th, after it was rebuilt,* Esdras *returned and restored this* Æra *the* 2*d time: And from that Year they began to reckon another* Æra, *and made the* 3*d Year of the* 2*d Temple Sabbatic: And they reckoned* 7 *Sabbatisms, and consecrated the* 50*th Year, altho' it was not* Jubile, *yet they reckoned under the* 2*d Temple, so as that they did consecrate Sabbatisms. Dionysius Petavius* also follows *Maimonides*, and is also of this Opinion (*r*). But as the Ignorance of the *Jews* in Chronological Affairs is very notorious, so there's nothing at all in this Discourse of *Maimonides* which would shake our Opinion, that is not apparently false; and argues the Author much mistaken about the Computation of *Esdras*, at the end of 70 Years Restauration. For *Calvisius* most truly (*s*) says, For

(*q*) Maimonides c. 10. de Schemitha & Jobel. (*r*) Lib. 9. de Doctrina Temp. c. 26. (*s*) Isag. c. 26.

who

who could ſuſpect that the *Jews* in a *Babylonian* Captivity of 70 Years, could forget their Sabbatic Years, and afterwards inſtitute others, which ſhould not be the ſame in order as thoſe before the Captivity? why ſhould not the *Jews* as well have forgot their Sabbath Day, and afterwards alſo inſtitute another? But this is impoſſible; for God, the Preſerver of his own Inſtitutions and Creatures would not have ſuffered ſuch Set-times to have been diſturbed from the Creation of the World: So that the true Sabbatic Years were not changed, but truly reſtored after the *Babyloniſh* Captivity: For the *Jews* in that Captivity had Fields, (*t*) planted Vineyards, mow'd and gather'd Grapes: So that they were buſied in thoſe very things as were moſt proper to put 'em in mind of their Sabbatic Years. Nor did their Exile endure beyond the Memory of any that were then alive. At this Day, where-ever they are diſperſed, they truly know and reckon up their Sabbatic Years. How then could theſe forget them, who had celebrated the Sabbatic Years in *Judea*, and were returned back again into *Judea* to celebrate them after their Captivity? But admitting they had forgot 'em, yet after their Return they would have learn'd 'em again of the *Samaritans*, who celebrated the Sabbatic Years with the *Jews* before the Captivity, and had conſtantly retain'd 'em all that time; for they were near Neighbours; the diſtance betwixt *Jeruſalem* and *Samaria* being not above 6 *German* Miles; and the Nation of the *Jews* was very ſuperſtitious and tenacious of their Ceremonies, as is well known. 'Tis therefore a vain thing for any one to ſuſpect a Change in the Sabbatic Years.

(*t*) Jer. 29.

§. 6.

Whether the Sabbatic and Jubilean Years never had, nor could have any other Form than ſuch a myſtical one wherein 343 Days are reckoned for a Year.

§. 6. A certain Author (*u*) does not only conjecture, but promiſes a Demonſtration of the Affirmative; but we deny both, and our Reaſons are, 1. Becauſe from the Author's own Confeſſion, neither the Scripture, nor any other, ancienter Book makes mention of ſuch a myſtic Year. 2. Becauſe the ſix Years of Agriculture have without doubt ſometimes coincided with the Solar Year: For otherwiſe the times of Sowing and Harveſt would have been uncertain. 3. Becauſe the (*w*) Scripture attributes to the Jubilean and Sabbatic Years a fixt Beginning and State. *Thou ſhalt reckon* (ſays God) *ſeven Weeks of Years*, &c. *Then thou ſhalt cauſe the Trumpet to ſound every where on the 7th Month, on the 10th day of the ſame Month, the Day of Expiations, ye ſhall cauſe the Trumpet to be ſounded throughout the whole Land.* From which Words Interpreters have hitherto inferr'd, that the *Jews* ought to begin the Jubilean Years from the ſame 10th day of the Month *Tiſri*; whereas 'tis immediately added, *That ye may ſanctifie the 50th Year.* And although the Author of Myſtical Computation (of whom we ſhall ſpeak in the next Section) hath ſought a Solution in the Ambiguity of the Word קרש as a Proclamation, or a Command of the Solemnity of the Jubilean Year; indeed it was joined to a certain Day of the Civil Calendar, whereas the Jubilean Year, without any Relation to this Command, took its Original elſewhere. .... How ill it becomes a Learned Man to trifle in a ſerious Affair: For who knows not that a better Account may be given of the Beginning, than of the Proclamation of the Jubilean Years? who is ignorant of

(*u*) Autor Solis & Clavis Temp. itemque vindiciarum. (*w*) Lev. 25. 9.

the

the Emphasis of the Word קדש ? Or who shall perswade himself that a Year should be sanctified amongst the *Jews* some Months before it began ? *Maimonides* speaks much juster (*x*) on this Subject. *From the beginning of the Year, to the Day of Expiations, the Servants were neither dismiss'd, nor did they serve their Masters, nor were the Fields restored. What then ? They did eat, drink, and were merry ; and every one put a Crown upon his Head : But as soon as the Day of Expiations was come, the Senators of the* Sanhedrin *sounded Trumpets, and sent away their Servants free; Fields were then also restored.* 4. From that mystic Form which is against the Laws of Sydereal Years, it would follow, that it might be possible that the Product of one should maintain the *Jews* for three Years together (against *Lev.* 25. 21. *& sequ.*) For although mention is there made of three Years ; yet by no means were they compleat and separately reckoned, as is evident from the Place just mentioned : On the contrary, 'tis evident that this Hypothesis brings in a new Method destitute of all Probability. For if (for Example) the Beginning of the Sabbatic Year should fall upon the Vernal Month *Nisan* ; which would sometimes happen, the *Jews* could not gather the Fruits, because of the Religion of the Year ; and consequently on the preceding Year they would hardly have given themselves the trouble of Sowing ; but neither was it lawful to sow about *Tisri* the Autumnal Month of the same Year : Therefore they could not mow about *Nisan* the Year following. It was therefore necessary for 'em to wait till they could have the Harvest of the 3d Year. ——

(*x*) In Halachu Schemidda Vejobel. c. 10.

§. 7.

The Mystic Sabbatic Cycle

§. 7. The Absurdity of that Opinion is hence evident: For admitting it, the Sabbatic Years would undoubtedly be wholly deprived of their best Character when amongst the Sabbatic Years, from the faithful Tradition of Historians, the intercepted time divisible into aliquot Parts should not always be 2401 Days, or the Quantity of a mystic Sabbatic Cycle.

The manner how the Author of mystic Chronology would prove his Opinion about the Sabbatic and Jubilean Years.

§. 8. The Author of (*y*) the mystic Chronology premises some Hypotheses, which, he says are founded in Scripture, and which are granted by all that allow of the Old Testament, whether *Christians*, *Jews*, or *Turks*.

1. That God made the World in six Days.

2. That on the 7th he rested from the Work of the Creation.

3. That any 7th from this, and consequently all the Multiples of 7 following one another in Arithmetic Progression (as 7. 14. 21. 28, &c.) were made Sabbaths or destin'd for Rest, in Memory of the preceding six Days Creation, and resting on the 7th.

4. Therefore if from any Sabbath we go backwards by the spaces of 7 Days, or the Interval of a Week, we shall at last come to that Day of Divine Rest.

5. And this is an inseparable Property, resulting from the Institution it self, and the Divine Fact, *viz.* That it should be a Multiple of the Time, and calls back into our Memory, and points at the Divine Rest, and the very individual Day thereof.

6. That God instituted a Sabbatic Year as well as a 7th Day, in memory of his Rest, in which he also would have the same (*z*) Arithmetic Progression.

(*y*) Sole Temp. p. 21. in vind. p. 4. (*z*) Lev. 25. 4.

7. That

7. That in the Sabbatic Years he would have obſerved and commanded the Obſervation not only of an (*a*) Arithmetic Progreſſion, but alſo a Geometric one, *viz.* the Square of the Sabbatic Year, or 7 7=49 Years he inſtituted for the *Jubile*.

8. The Sabbatic Year ought to be neither greater nor leſs than the time of Labour and (*a*) Fruits or Culture of the Earth which in this Year God would have omitted.

9. That time muſt be greater than 49, and leſs than 366 Days.

10. That there is no Number betwixt 49 and 366, by which we can return back again to the Root 7, unleſs 343, *viz.* the Cube of 7.

From theſe Hypotheſes he ſays, follows this Apogogic Syllogiſm. Every memorial time of Divine Reſt taken from the 7th Day of Creation, ought to be multiple of the Number 7, and by a given Regreſſion, *viz.* both Arithmetic and Geometric in a given Proportion, *viz.* Septuple, to point out the firſt of the Divine Reſt, or the Individual 7th of the Creation:

But the *Moſaic*, Sabbatic and Jubilean Years are a memorial time of Divine Reſt begun on the 7th Day of the Creation:

Ergo, &c.

And hence further he adds an *Epiſtomonic* Syllogiſm, as he calls it. Whatever Years ought to be multiple of the 7th Day of Creation, and ſhew the ſame by a regreſſion as well Arithmetic as Geometric, muſt conſiſt of ſome Number betwixt 49 and 366; between which 'tis impoſſible they ſhould be either more or leſs than 343:

(*a*) Lev. 25. 4.

But

But the Sabbatic and Jubilean Years ought to be multiple of the 7th Day of Creation, and shew it by a Progression as well Arithmetic as Geometric; and to consist of a Number betwixt 49 and 366: Therefore 'tis impossible that the Sabbatic and Jubilean Years should have either more or fewer Days than 343. 10. 10, &c.

This is the *Basis* of this mystic Computation; but which is built upon the Sand: For first of all our Mysteriographer puts us in mind of a strange Agreement betwixt *Christians*, *Jews* and *Turks*, in their admitting of the Old Testament. But how great soever the Agreement of the two former be, that of the *Turks* is a Dream of the Author. Indeed we know the (*b*) *Turks value the Law of* Moses, *believe that Christ is the Son of* Mary, *the Spirit of God, his Word and his Apostle*, but only in such a sense as *Mahomet* has left them. The *Turks* tell us of many things depraved in the old, many things omitted, and many added: Nor do they acknowledge the History of the Creation or the first Week from the *Mosaic* Writings, as the *Christians* and *Jews* do; but are wont to report many Fables of them, which that Impostor invented; as when God made *Adam*, the Throne of God, Paradise, &c. he held in his Hand a Pen 500 Miles long, and 80 broad. Besides, the *Turks* keep not the 7th but the 6th Day of the Week holy, contrary to *Moses*. So little occasion has our Author from the Agreement of the *Turks* for the Foundation of any of their Hypotheses; nor according to the sense of his 5th Hypothesis will meet with great Agreement betwixt the *Christians* and *Jews*. The Times of our Saviour's Nativity, his Circumcision, of the Eremetic

(*b*) Hotting. in Hist. Orient. p. 409.

Fast,

Fast, &c. are Memorials of those things which hapned long since; though no one ever yet of any mystic Mulriples. Further, the 6th, 8th, and 9th Hypotheses are no where extant in the Old Testament; nor are they received by any Christians, if you except our (c) Author and his Disciples; nor are they granted by the *Jews* (not to mention the *Turks*.) God had no respect to the first Sabbath in constituting this System of Years; that from the 7th Day of the Creation the Quantity of the Year should be deduced by an Arithmetic and Geometric Progression; there are no Footsteps of it in that place our Author has cited in *Leviticus*. But the rest are evident. So very false do we find our Author's Philosophy, when we consider the (d) Amplitude of of the Divine Promises. In short, the Author of this mystic Computation has acted ignorantly, when he makes one of his Limits a System of 366 Days, when the *Jews* knew nothing of it, their *Annus Communis* being 354 Days, their *Annus Embolimæus* 384, and the Mean 367. Having shewed the Falsity of these Hypotheses, we easily see what Answer ought to be given to the Discoverer of such Paralogisms, in which there is not the least Probability.

Of the chief Reasons why the Sabbatic Cycle was instituted.

§. 8. Although the Divine Wisdom is inscrutable, yet we ought not to reject their pious Opinions, who observe these as Reasons of such a Divine Institution. (f) 1. God. 2. the Earth. 3. the Poor. 4. Strangers. 5. Brutes. 6. Servants. 7. Debtors. 8. all the *Israelites* promiscuously.

In the 7th Year the First-Fruits were consecrated to God, and the Tythes to the Priests.

§. 9. 'Tis the allowed Opinion of (e) *Alphons. Abulensis Episcopus*, That the Oblation of First-Fruits did not cease; because though the Fruits

(c) Hanlinus. (d) Lev. 26. 3, 4, 5. (e) Ex. 23. 11. Lev. 25. 4. Deut. 31. Dr. D. Waith. strong Mos. (f) Com. in Lev.

were not gathered in for the use of their Masters as being common for any one, yet the Right of their Fields did belong to them, or the Privilege, or Excellency, as some say, before all others. So that it's probable they might gather the First-Fruits, and offer some part to the Priests. But as to the *Tenths*, the Priests had nothing to complain of, if in that Year wherein the Fruits were not gathered (that they might be preserved for their Masters Use) they did not receive the *Tenths*. 1. Because in that Year wherein God did bestow as much as was necessary, for three Years, the Tenths of the Priests were multiplied. 2. Because it was free for them in common with poor Persons and Strangers, to enjoy the Benefit of such gathering, provided they laid 'em not up in Barns or Granaries.

Of the Streights that every 7 year reduced the Jews *to.*

§. 9. So long as the *Jews* lived in obedience to the Law, they wanted not abundance of Encrease: but when they began to rebel and grow stubborn, they sufficiently experienc'd what things God had forbidden the Transgressors of his Laws. For when their Conquerors impos'd Tributes upon them they could not discharge 'em on the 7th Year. *Josephus* often mentions this Calamity, and his Relation about *Alexander* the *Macedonian*, sufficiently proves it: For when at *Jerusalem* he had learnt, that a *Grecian* should have the Government of the *Persians*, glad of the Prophecy, as to be fulfilled in him, he bid the *Jews* ask some great thing of him; to whom they answered, he could give nothing greater than a Relaxation of the Tributes for the 7th Year; and that was their (g) Request.

(g) Vid. Cunæum de Repub. Jud. l. 1. c. 4. l.

CHAP. IV.

Of the greater ſacred Annual Character, or the Jubilean Cycle.

1. *The Jubilean Cycle is a Syſtem of 7 Sabbatic Cycles, or 49 Lunæ-Solar Years continually recurring; and for this end divinely inſtituted, that in the Judaic Republic, the Wealth of a few ſhould not oppreſs the reſt; but that the Good of the Tribes ſhould always be immovable; as alſo that the Years of Servitude might ceaſe.*

§. 1. THE Word *Jubile* is not *à Jubilo*, as thoſe little read in *Hebrew* ſuppoſe; nor from the ruſtic Inclamation of the *Greeks*, ἰὺ βάλλω; but either from יוֹבֵל which Word ſignifies a Ram, becauſe this Solennity was promulgated with a (*b*) Ram's Horn; or elſe from יָבַל which Root ſignifies a *bringing back*; and that, as *Serarius* notes upon *Joſhua*, with a certain ſingular Emphaſis of Joy and Mirth. *Why this Cycle and firſt of all its laſt year ſhould be called a Jubile.*

§. 1. (*b*) *Torniellus* ſuppoſes it probable that the *Jews* never obſerved any Jubilean Year before the *Babylonian* Captivity. But we dare not aſſert ſo much; whereas not only in the time of *Joſhua*, but the pious Kings, as *David*, *Joſhaphat*, and others, its very probable they would have ſome reſpect to the Reaſon of ſuch a Divine Inſtitution. In the 2d *Kings* (*c*) the Jubilean Year ſeems to be deſcribed, when K. *Joram* graciouſly gave the *Shunamitiſh* Woman *Whether we have yet any Footſteps of the Obſervation of the Jubilean Year.*

(*a*) Joſh 6. 5. (*b*) In Annalib. ad An. 1584 Numb. 2 & 3. (*c*) v. 1. & ſequ.

those Privileges that were proper to a Jubilean Year; and yet the Circumstances of History seem to render this Opinion suspected: For *Joram* lived about the Year 3053, and in 3061 was killed by *Jehu*, in which 8 Years no Jubile could happen. Perhaps that in *Ezech.* 29.17. more probably refers to a Jubile, where he makes mention of a 27th Year: For I cannot see how that can relate to any other *Epocha* at this time known; Of which more hereafter.

The Jubilean Cycle consisted of 49 Years

§. 3. Whereas 'tis very certain we have not so many Jubilean as Sabbatic Years: And therefore from the latter we can scarce judge of the Jubilean Cycle. From hence it happens that Chronologers so little agree about the Quantity of this Cycle, but dispute with the greatest Heats of these Darknesses of the ancient Laws. Of the five Opinions about this matter, the first is, That the Jubilean Cycle consisted of 50 (*d*) Years; the second is that of the famous *William Langius*, who (*e*) contends that the Jubilean Year depended upon the Sabbatic ones, yet so, that after the Expiration of 7 annual Sabbatic Years, the same was one with the 50th; so that the Jubilean Year was always the first in the Annual 7: The third is the Opinion of our Mystic Chronologer, who makes the Jubilean Cycle to be of 45 *Julian* Years and 271 Days over; The fourth Opinion is theirs (*f*), who assert the Jubilean Year was the same with 7 times the 7th Year, or 7 times the Sabbatic Year, and so the Jubilean Cycle precisely made 49 Years: The fifth Opinion is on-

(*d*) Hier. Sa'in. ad an. 2544. Serarius ad Josh. 13. Pareus, Cor. à Lap. in Lev. 25. (*e*) L. de an. Christi c. 11. p. 138, & seq. (*f*) Jos. Scal. Buntingus, Mesilinus, Codomannus, Mercator, Calv. Ubbo Emmius, Helvicus, B. Thummius, B. Behmius, Spanhemius, Petavius, Cloppenburgius, Junius, Tremellius, *and many more.*

ly

ly propoſed as probable by the ſame *Cloppenburgius* (*g*); where he ſuppoſes it poſſible for the *Jews* to mix their Computation, and reckon both by 49 and 50 Years, which he ſuppoſes very eaſie for 'em to do, the great Period of Jubilean Years being admitted, which is made by multiplying 49 into 50, whoſe Product makes that Period 2450. We aſſent to their Opinion who aſſert the Jubilean Cycle to conſiſt of 49 Lunæ-Solar Years: For beſides that, the Sabbatic Year had many Privileges in common with the Jubilean Year, which is inferr'd from the Biblic Style, the Conſent of the *Jews*, and *Rabbi Adda*'s Calendar, it would follow alſo that if the Jubilean Year was different from the Sabbatic; the Earth would reſt for two whole Years, and the *Jews* muſt ſuſtain themſelves with the Produce of one Year for four Years together, which ſeems wholly repugnant to the Senſe of the Divine Command: Nor does it hinder that the ſame Jubilean Year in the *Moſaic* Text is ſometimes called the *Quinquageſimus*, whereas that is not to be otherwiſe underſtood than as *Pindar* called the Olympiad, ἐννεαετηρίδα, and as we are wont to call the 7th Day the 8th.

Of thoſe Characters which the Popes Inſtituted for their Jubilean Years.

§. 4. The *Roman* Pontiffs, after the manner of Apes, have endeavoured to imitate the Inſtitution of God in their Jubilean Inſtitutions; but divers of 'em after different manners. The firſt Author of a Jubilean Year was *Boniface* the 8th, whoſe Encomium *Platina* (*h*) gives: He ordained that every 100 Years the Treaſury of Indulgences ſhould be open'd; but the Publication of a peculiar Bull which is (*i*) extant, and which inſtituted the 1300th Year to

(*g*) Schol. Sacrif. p. 42. (*h*) P. 231. de U. P. (*i*) In Extrav. L. U. de pœnit. remiſ. c. 2.

be Jubilean. But *Clemens* the ſixth, (this precarious Inſtitution of *Boniface*, ſince the Age of Man not extending to 100 Years, might ſee no Jubile) made every 50th Year Jubilean; to which end he gave notice in the Year 1345 that the following 1350 ſhould be a Jubile. This Bull is extant in the Book laſt cited in the Chapter of *Unigenitus*, in that Year, as *Petrarcha* witneſſes, there was ſuch a Concourſe of People at *Rome*, that it was no wonder if from ſuch a defiled Air a moſt grievous Plague aroſe, which ſo exhauſted all *Italy*, that there were ſcarce Ten Thouſand left alive. But *Urban* the ſixth corrected this Inſtitution, transferring the Jubile from the 50th Year to the 33d; and he appointed that the Year 1390 ſhould be Jubile: And afterwards he continued every 33 Years; whereof he ſaw not the firſt, but died in 1389: yet *Boniface* the ninth celebrated the Jubile which was forbidden by *Urban* the ſixth; yet ſo as that in the Year 1400 he again forbad the Jubiley, as (k) *Onuphrius* witneſſes. Laſtly, when the *Romans* perceived that theſe Jubilean Concourſes were advantageous to them, *Paul* the ſecond reduced the time of the Jubile to 25 Years, the Sanction whereof his Succeſſor *Sextus* the fourth confirmed by a peculiar Bull in the Year 1473, which is extant in the ſame Book c. *Quemadmodum*. And by that it was ordained, that in the Year 1475 the Jubile was celebrated, and every 25th Year following. But of theſe Annual Jubilean Solennities, and their Privileges (which are Indulgences) and of which you may read more largely in their Bulls above-cited, this is not the leaſt Solennity, *viz.* At that time the Pope

(k) Vide etiam Krantzii Metrop. olin. l. 10.

opens

opens (as they call it) a golden Gate, to which an infinite Concourſe of Men approach for obtaining the Remiſſion of their Sins; then he ſtrikes the Gate with a little golden Mallet, which afterwards, as a Token of Honour, he gives to ſomebody; then the Workmen break the Gate with Bars, and the People who force in, ſcramble for the Ruins of it among the Dirt and under the Feet of one another.

CHAP. V.

Of the Solar Cycle.

1. *The Solar Cycle is a certain Syſtem of Time, conſiſting of* 28 *Years, or* 7 Julian Luſtra's, *which being elapſed, the ſame Order of Biſſextiles or Dominical Leters, return again, according to the old Method.*

§. 1. THE Solar Cycle is call'd a *Period* of 28 Years; not becauſe it ſhews the Motion of the Sun, but becauſe by its help we know the Dominical Letter or the Character of *Sunday*; and hence it appears, that this Appellation is Metonymical, not proper; altho' the Cycle, if it be wholly conſidered, does retain the Characters of each of the 28 Years, and the Denomination of the whole from the Number of the Cycle ſought. *The Reaſon why the Solar Cycle is called a Period of* 28 *Years.*

§. 2. The Reaſon is, becauſe neither ſooner nor later than after 28 Years, all the Varieties return again which ariſe from the Changes of the Dominical Letter and Biſſextile: For if in the *Nabonaſſarean* Year there had been no Biſ- *Why the Ancients made the Period of Biſſextiles & Dominical Letters to conſiſt of* 28 *Years.*

(a) Vide Polyd. Virg. de invent. rerum, c. 8.

sextile, the Cycle of 7 Years would have sufficed, because when on the same Day that a common Year ended, upon which it began, the following year would also begin on the following Day, &c. But the Bissextile Year renders this Affair more difficult: So that a Cycle of 7 Years will not be sufficient, because the last Day in the Year is not the same on which it began, but the following: so that in the space of 7 Years all the Variety cannot recurr as before, but there must be the Number of Years for a Bissextile, *viz.* 4, and the Number of Days in a Week, *viz.* 7. that are concerned, which multiplied, make 47 = 28 the Solar Cycle. *Vide Monach. Method. cap.* 3.

Of the time of the Institution of this Cycle.

§. 3. The time of this Institution is not certain. (a) *Scaliger* deduces it from the Year of Christ 328, when the Nicene Council was dissolved. From which *Dionysius* (b) *Petavius* blames *Scaliger*, as his way is; saying, *Scaliger* only guesses it, and derives a false Opinion of it, in thinking that the Nicene Council continued till that time. In like manner (c) *Langius* thinks the Solar Cycle was owing to the fourth Year after the Nicene Council, but with no greater Certainty than *Scaliger* had proposed his Opinion before him. We cannot from any ancient Books find any Certainty about it.

Of the Use of the Solar Cycle.

§. 4. It shews the initial Day of every Year in the *Julian* Account, and consequently it directs us to the Weekly Characters of the other Days, the Dominical Letter, and the Quantity of the Year.

(a) Lib. 2. Canonum Isagog. p. 172. (b) Lib. 6. de Doctrina Temp. cap. 28. (c) Lib. 2. de Annis Christi, c. 7.

§. 5.

§. 5. This varies according to the diversity of the *Julian* and *Gregorian* Calendar. For the *Julian* the following Table will serve for ever.

Of the Dispersion of the Dominical Letters, and the initial in the Solar Cycle.

Cycl.	f. init.	l. Dom.	Cycl.	f. init.	l. Dom.
1	2	GF	15	6	C
2	4	E	16	7	B
3	5	D	17	1	AG
4	6	C	18	3	F
5	7	BA	19	4	E
6	2	G	20	5	D
7	3	F	21	6	CB
8	4	E	22	1	A
9	5	DC	23	2	G
10	7	B	24	3	F
11	1	A	25	4	ED
12	2	G	26	6	C
13	3	FE	27	7	B
14	5	D	28	1	A

But in respect of the *Gregorian* Calendar, the last Table fails; and for the present Age that which follows will serve.

Cycl.

Cycl.	f.	init.	l.	Dom.	Cycl.	f.	init.	l.	Dom.
1	CB		6		15	F		3	
2	A		1		16	E		4	
3	G		2		17	DC		5	
4	F		3		18	B		7	
5	ED		4		19	A		1	
6	C		6		20	G		2	
7	B		7		21	FE		3	
8	A		1		22	D		5	
9	GF		2		23	C		6	
10	E		4		24	B		7	
11	D		5		25	AG		1	
12	C		6		26	F		3	
13	BA		7		27	E		4	
14	G		2		28	D		5	

Of the Order how the Characteristic Letters of the Days in the Week are placed.

§. 6. There are not now eight Letters as were in the old *Julian* Calendar, but only 7; and they are placed in a retrograde Order, as is evident from the preceding Tables: Whence also *Beda* expreſt the Order of the Dominical Letters in this Verſicle:

Grandia, Frendet Equus, Dum Cernit Belliger Arma.

Of what would be deſirable in the ancient diſpoſition of the Solar Cycle.

§. 7. If we conſider the Conſtitution of the Civil Year, the Cycle is convenient enough; but it anſwers leſs accurately to the Reaſon of the Solar Year; becauſe it ſuppoſes that every Year is 365 Days and 6 Hours; whereas there are 11 Minutes wanting of that time.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Of the Lunar Cycle.

1. *The Lunar Cycle or Golden Number, consisting of 19 Lunæ-Solar Years, whereof 12 are of 30 Days, 7 of 28 Days to the Month, as a System of* Julian *Solar Years; which being elapsed, the mean New Moons are supposed to return upon the same Days.*

Of the Number of Years, that are required for the Sun and Moon to coincide again.

§. 1. BEcause the *Greeks* were taught by their Oracles, that their accustomed Sacrifices were to be offered κατὰ σελάς, which they interpreted of the Years of the *Sun*, of their Days and Months, which they referr'd to the *Moon*; and were always sollicitous, how by certain Periods and disagreeing Motions of the Luminaries they might reduce these to a *Third* something in which they might agree; Hence in the ancient times they are said to have used a *Biennium*, intercalating every other Year: But Fault was found with this, and 'twas succeeded by a *Quadrennium*; upon whose Returns the Olympic Games were celebrated. After this came the *Octennium*, of which mention is made in rehearsing the times of (*a*) *Cadmus*. Κάδμος ὁ, &c. *But* Cadmus *sewed* Mars *every Year for those whom he slew: But that Year was then the space of* 8 *Years.* (*b*) *Hyppolitus, Cleostratus, Tenedus,*

(*a*) Apollod. Bibl. l. 3. (*b*) Vide Euseb. Ec. l. 7. c. 20. Censor. de D. N. c. 6. Macr. l. 1. Sat. c. 12. Scal. de Emend. temp. l. 2. p. 46. Pet. de doct. temp. T. 1. l. 2. c. 2. & in Uranolog. l. 4. cap. 1.

Har-

Harpalus, and others of the Ancients seem to have interpolated this Period of Years. Next come the *Duodennium*, which seems to have been observed by the Learned only, and may be gather'd from *Censorinus c.* 18. The next was the *Dodecaeteris*, consisting of 12 Years. To this *Chaldaic Year* there is a Name, which those that deal in Nativities accommodate not to the Course of the Sun or Moon, but other Observations: *Because then*, say they, *Tempests, the good Success of Fruits, Barrenness, and Diseases happned.* But amongst all the Cycles of the Ancients, there's none more famous than *Ἐνιαυτὸς Μέτωνος* of *Meto* the *Athenian*, which is used to be called *The great Year of* Meto, although it's uncertain whether *Meto* was the first Author of this Cycle; tho' *Livius* seems to attribute this Invention to *Numa Pompilius*, and *Geminus* to *Eudemonus* and *Philippus*. This is certain, that this Cycle consisting of 19 Years comprehends 6946 Days, or 19 Solar Years, and almost so many Lunar years, in which they interpolated 7 times in this Order, according to *Dionysius Petavius*, 3, 6, 8, 11, 14, 17, 19. But in the Course of this time *Meto*, or whoever was the Author of this Cycle, thought that 235 Lunations would be exactly compleated, a hundred and ten New, and a hundred and twenty five Full Moons, making nineteen Solar Years; afterwards *Calippus* attempted to correct this Period by conjoining four *Metonic Cycles*, and giving to them 22759 Days, taking away one Day in the space of 76 Years. And yet *Calippus* found many other Censors and Correctors, as *Democritus*, *Hipparchus*, *Ptolemy*, and others; All which did not wholly reject, but only interpolated the *Metonic Cycle*.

§. 2.

§. 2. All this was done at first that the *Pasca* might be rightly observed, and that in one Night the Sacrifice of Prayer might every where be offered for the *Resurrection of the Lord*; for 'tis certain in rightly celebrating the *Pasca*, they had respect in the force of the Divine Institution, both to the Reason of the Sun and Moon, though they a little mistook themselves; because they thought the *Julian Year* and Solar Tropic did agree well together. *Why not only Greek Infidels, but also Christians at the beginning of the N. Testament were so sollicitous of the Harmony of the Lunar-Solar Motions.*

§. 3. In ancient times the Asiatic Christians did continually celebrate the *Pasca* upon the 14th Moon, or in the Full Moon, *viz.* at the same time with the *Jews*; and these alledged *John the Evangelist*, from whom they received this Custom. But the Eastern Christians never celebrated the Solennity of the *Pasca*, except upon the Lord's Day; nay, when they seemed to have this Solennity in common with the *Jews*, and they alledged for themselves the Custom of St. *Peter*. The *Montanists* receded from both, neglecting the Lunar Course; but looking only to the Solar, appointing the 9th Calendar of *April* to be the *Vernal Æquinox*, and the *Pasca* to be observed upon the 14th from this Day. Among the *French Martinus Dumiensis* and *Beda* relate that the *Pasca* was anciently observed the 25th of *March*, the Custom of whom, when *Cirvelius* would again introduce, he was for that stigmatized for his Rashness by *Mariana*. *Of the chief Disagreement of the Ancients in the Command of the Pascal Solennity, and for what reason the Lunar Cycle was observed.*

§. 4. And they kept not the Solennities of their *Fasti* as indifferent things; but against the Rule of St. *Paul*, they condemned one another for neglecting the Punctilio's of time. Now *Pius* the first, and after him *Eleutherius* were taken up with this Affair; but above all the rest, *Victor* acted most violently, sending the Thunder *Of the great Esteem that Christians had for these Controversies.*

der of his Anathema againſt the *Greeks*; but was ſucceſsleſs, as many others of the Popes were. The venerable Seſſion at *Nicea* at laſt by degrees aſſwaged his exaſperated Diſpoſition, as afterwards this Cuſtom of the Weſtern Chriſtians obtained, according to *Euſebius*, *Theodoret*, *&c.*

Of the time in which the Uſe of the Lunar Cycle was known to Chriſtians.

§. 5. (c) *Anatolius* upon *Euſebius* mentions, that firſt of all in the time of the Nicene Council the Uſe of this Cycle had been known: and this appears from an Epiſtle of St. *Ambroſe*, *'Tis not a mean part of Wiſdom to define the Day of the paſcal Solemn Aſſembly; both Divine Scripture inſtructs in it, and the Tradition of our Anceſtors, who aſſembling at the Nicene Synod, amongſt other things relating to Faith, did collect as well true as admirable Decrees; for in that memorable Aſſembly, ſeveral Perſons skilful in Calculation, being gathered together, did as it were conſtitute a Circle of* 19 *Years, as an Example for following Generations. This Circle they called* Enneadecaeterida. *Let us follow that Example; not that we ought to doubt with any vain Opinion concerning ſo great an Aſſembly; but true Reaſon being found in it, let the Affections of all ſo concur, that upon the ſame Night our Sacrifice may be offer'd for the Reſurrection of our Lord.*

Whether the Chriſtians *received the Lunar Cycle from the* Jews.

§. 6. Altho' we ſay that we have thoſe things which the Chriſtians firſt invented from the Latter *Jews*, yet from the Scope which the firſt Authors of the Cycle intended, it ſeems apparent that they examined the ſecret Writings of the *Jews*, leſt they ſhould celebrate at the ſame time the Feaſt of the *Paſca* with Unbelievers: For ſuppoſe the ancient Lunar Cycle together with the Paſcal Times were different from the

(c) Lib. Cap. 2.

Cy-

Cycle of the *Jews*, certainly Christians, could not know by the Use of the same Cycle at what time the *Jews* would celebrate the *Pasca*, nor how they ought to refrain from the sacred Things of their Adversaries (*d*): *Isaacus Argivus* confirms my Opinion in this, that before the *Pasca* of the Christians the *Judaic* one was placed; which in the Holy, and first *Oecumenic* Synod, the Holy Fathers so constituted, that it might be observed in what Day of the Week the *Pasca* of the *Jews* fell, that on the following Lord's Day the Christians might perform theirs.

§. 7. Tho' the first Authors of the Lunar Cycle thought that 19 Lunæ-Solar Years were equal to 19 *Julian* Years, yet 'tis not so, if we regard Mathematical Rigour; for they will fall betwixt both: For 19 *Julian* Years make 6939 D. 18 H. but 19 Lunar Solar Years contain only 6939 D. 16 H. 32', 20", whose difference is 1 H. 27', 40", yearly. And so much do 19 mean New and Full Moons lose every 19 Years which in about 1257 Years make four Days almost.

Whether or no the first Authors of the Lunar Cycle thought that 19 Luna-Solar Years, or 235 Lunations were equal to 19 equal Jul. Years.

§. 8. To find the just time of the *Pasca*, the ancient Christians, as was now said, used the Lunar Cycle; and that the Use hereof may more largely appear, we shall lay down the whole Lunar Cycle, with the Paschal times, in which the utmost Limits are the 23d of *March*, (for upon this Day the Author of the *Vernal Equinox* would have it fall, which the Full Moon Paschal ought always to precede very nearly; and *April* the 19th; whence Christians would never celebrate their *Pasca* before the 22d of *March*, or after the 25th of *April*. To which the ancient Verses of those Computers have Relation.

The manner how the Ancients us'd the Lunar Cycle, noting down Paschal Limits from its Numbers.

Extremum Pasca monstrat tua passio Marce,

(*d*) Ration. pag. 9. de doct. Temp. T. 1. p. 615.

Item,

Item,

Pascha nec undenas Aprilis ante Kalendas,
Nec post septenas Maii valet esse Kalendas.

C. ☾.	T. P.		C. ☾.	T. P.	
1	April	5	11	Apr.	15
2	Mar.	25	12	Apr.	4
3	April	13	13	Mar.	24
4	April	2	14	Apr.	12
5	Mar.	22	15	Apr.	1
6	April	10	16	Mar.	21
7	Mar.	30	17	Apr.	9
8	April	18	18	Mar.	29
9	April	7	19	Apr.	17
10	Mar.	27			

But in the *Gregorian* Year the Paschal Limits are found by the Lunar Cycle till the Year 1700 from the following Table:

C. ☾.	T. P.		C. ☾.	T. P.	
1	April	12	11	Mar.	23
2	April	1	12	Apr.	11
3	Mar.	21	13	Mar.	31
4	April	9	14	Apr.	18
5	Mar.	29	15	Apr.	8
6	April	17	16	Mar.	28
7	April	6	17	Apr.	16
8	Mar.	26	18	Apr.	5
9	April	14	19	Mar.	25
10	April	3			

The Reason why the Character of the Lunar Cycle was in times past called the Golden Number.

§. 9. Some think that for its Worth and great Use that it might be compared with Gold, and from this Comparison take its Name; whereas it was a Rule for the Ancients in calculating the Full and New Moons, upon

upon which account (e) *Petavius* says, *Beginning at any Year. For Example, from that which gives a New Moon on the* 23*d of* Jan. Feb. 21*ſt*, March 23*d*, *&c. Upon thoſe Days he wrote the Figure* 1 *in the Margin of the Calendar, on the* 2*d Year they conſidered and found the New Moons got forward about* 11 *Days*, viz. *on* Feb. 10. *and* March *the* 12*th*, *&c. and againſt thoſe Days they placed in their Calendar the Figure* 2. *So on the* 3*d*, 4*th and following Years upon thoſe Days, that the New Moon fell every Month they placed the Figures* 3, 4, *&c. againſt them in the Calendar. And at laſt having paſt over* 19 *Years, they renewed the ſame Figures again. Theſe were the Figures or Numbers in the Calendar which were called the* Golden Number. Others relate that the *Alexandrians* in times paſt ſent this Cycle to the *Romans* in a Silver Table, writ with Golden Figures, and thence they took their Name.

CHAP. VII.

Of the Cycle of Indiction.

1. *The Cycle of Indiction is a Syſtem of* 15 Julian *Years perpetually recurring, that the times of certain Penſions might be made known to the* Roman *Subjects.*

§. 1. SOme of the *Græcians* will have *Indictio quaſi in Actio*; and *Cedrenus* is admired for following this Opinion. *Onuphrius* will have *Indictio* to come *ab Indice Crucis*, ſeen

What we ought to underſtand by the Name Indiction.

(e) Ration. p. 9. & de doct. temp. T. 1. p. 615.

by *Conſtantine* when he fought againſt *Maxentius*: But theſe are frivolous Conjectures. *Indictio* rather comes *ab indicere*, and was particularly uſed at firſt to denominate a certain Species of Penſions. (*a*) *Aſcanius* reckons up three kinds of Penſions or rather Penſitations, well known to the ancient *Romans*. Firſt, the *Canon* to which Impoſts, Tributes, &c. were referr'd. Secondly, the *Oblation*, at this time called the *Aids*: And Thirdly, the *Indiction*, which the Ancients called *Collecting*. *Cicero* alſo calls it *collected*. The *Greeks* call this Cycle πεντακαιδεκαετηρίδα. *Dio* calls it ἐκκαιδεκαετῆ χρόνον. In the ſame Senſe that the *Olympias* is called πενταέτεις. Alſo χρηματισμὸν, κύκλον ἢ νεμήσεως, &c. which laſt Words are uſed by the Writers of the *Antiochian* Hiſtory. By the (*b*) *Latines Diſtributiones* and *Fuſiones* were commonly uſed inſtead of *Indictiones*.

Of the Original and Antiquity of theſe Indictions.

§. 2. There are many Opinions in this matter. The chief are theſe: (*c*) Firſt, *Dionyſius Petavius* brings a great many Opinions about the time; but thinks them all Conjectures. (*d*) *Joſeph Scaliger* thinks this kind of Penſion of long ſtanding; and that anciently 'twas the ſame with the *Luſtrum* of 5 Years; whence we find this Inſcription on Moneys Λ. Β. and Λ. Γ. *viz.* λέσχῳ δευτέρῳ, λέσχῳ τρίτῳ, &c. There are (*e*) others which deduce theſe *Indictions* from the *Antiochian Æra*, which was about 48 years before Chriſt; from whence they alſo deduce the *Julian*, *Adrian*, *Antonian*, *Conſtantinian*, *Valentinian*, &c. Indictions. (*f*) Others will

(*a*) Apud Budæum in Pandect p. 83. (*b*) Pallad. de Rebus Geſtis, Chryſoſt. & Cod. Theod. de Indulg Debit. (*c*) Lib. 11. de doct. temp. item in Ration. p. 1. l. 6. c 1. (*d*) Canon. Iſagog. l. 3. p. 179. (*e*) Scal. in Animadv. ad Euſeb. Jac. Uſſerius in Annal. ad ætat. mund. ſext. p. 320. (*f*) Maximus Monachus & Martyr in brevi enarratione Chriſtiani Paſch. Gr. Mon.

have

have the *Æra* of Indictions begin with the 2d of *Auguſtus*. Others again (*g*) will have the Indictions begin at that time when *Auguſtus* overcame *Antonius* at the Promontory of *Epirus* near *Nicopolis*; which hapned about 31 years before Chriſt. Sixthly, the famous (*h*) *Langius* propoſes a Conjecture to be examined by the Learned, whether or no this Cycle belongs not to the Emperour *Adrian*, from the Annotation of a certain anonymous Author in the firſt year of the 224th Olympiad. Adrian *coming to* Rome, *remitted thoſe things which were done to the publick Treaſury of the Emperour and* Roman *People, conſtituting a time of* 16 *years, from whence, and to which it ſhould become due.* He whom this Learned Writer calls *Anonymus*, is the ſame with *Dio. Caſſius*, who has almoſt the very ſame Words in the Hiſtory of *Adrian*; as alſo in the Hiſtory of *Marcus Antoninus*. Seventhly, There are thoſe (*i*) who ſettle theſe Indictions in the Year of Chriſt 313. becauſe in that Year *Conſtantine* overcame *Maxentius*; and ſuppoſe that this Tyrant was caſt off the *Milvian* Bridge and drowned. The Eighth and laſt Opinion is the Vulgar; that the Calculation of Indictions began on the 24th of *September* in the Year of Chriſt 312, which muſt certainly be true, from the Words of (*k*) *Euſebius*. Ἐνδικτιώνων Κωνσταντινιανῶν ἐντὸς ἔτους ἑβδόμης. This *Baronius*, and his Epitomizer *Spondanus*, object againſt *Scaliger*. (*l*) *Calviſius* admits of no other Original of *Indictions* than this. Alſo *Petavius*, becauſe he would not contend againſt either Opinion, ſays, The vulgar Indictions were deduced from the year

(*g*) Cedrenus & al. (*h*) L. 1. de Anno Chriſti, c 8. (*i*) Pantagathus Onuphrius in Faſtis. Scal. Marc. Zuet. Boxhorn. Hiſt. Univerſal. p. 267. (*k*) In the 4th Year of the 272d Olymp. (*l*) Iſag. c. 16.

of Christ 312. The same is also held by (m) *Albericus Gentilis*. We also are of the same Judgment; yet, First, we distinguish betwixt the *Lustra* and *Indictions*, which *Scaliger* confounds. Secondly, betwixt the common Indictions, and those which kept their stated Intervals, and the Uncommon, which were instituted according to the Will of the Emperor and the Exigence of the Republick, as other Pensions were. Thirdly, betwixt the Indictions themselves and the Cycle of Indictions; or betwixt the Political and Chronological Use of Indictions. For it is certain, that the Indictions which are referr'd to the ancient and more modern Times can be deduced only from the Year of Christ 312, except any one had rather understand by a Year the remote Interval of πεντακαιδεκαετηρίδος. Fourthly, we again note that the first Year of Indictions may be joined to the Year of Christ 313. if we have reference to the last 9 Months, the greater part of that Cyclic Year: for the first year of Indictions began *Sept.* 24, or the 8th of the *Calends* of *October*, *Anno Christi* 312; whence it is evident that the rest of the indictionary Months may very commodiously be referred to the Year 313.

Whether the Custom of reckoning the Times was 1st thought on by the Christians to reconcile the Evangelists with prophane Historians.

§. 3. So (m) dreams a certain Person, when in his *new*, *true* and *exact Chronology*, falsely so called, he delivers a great many Falsities about the Original of Indictions; which it would be too troublesome to relate and confute. Those that please may consult the Author.

Why the quindecennial Cycle of Indictions was 1st instituted.

§. 4. Historians labour under great Incertainties in naming the Cause of this Institution. *Herwart's* Opinion is rejected: *Scaliger's* agrees not

(m) De diverf. temp. Apell. c. 2. (n) Joannes Georgius Herw. de Hohenb.

well

well with himself, where (o) he labours in one place for the Antiquity of the *Antiochian* Indictions; and elsewhere that they were deduced from the *Quinquennales* and *Vicennales* of *Constantine*; but if the Elapsed from 15 years to 20 was called an *Indiction*, consequently all the rest of the τετραετηρίδες may be so called: which Opinion about *Constantine* is as different from the Principles of Historians. So it is well confuted by *D.* (p) *Behmius*, and rejected even by *Scaliger*'s own Followers. Nor was Cardinal *Baronius* more happy in opining; for he supposed that the Cycle of *Constantine* ceased, especially as to its Use, among the *Roman* Soldiers: In the year of Christ 312, when by the Institution thereof it came to pass, that having served 15 years, might have his Dismission, and go free where-ever he pleased without any Capitation: Or if he would tarry, he should then have greater Advantages; whereas formerly they were to serve 16 years; which Opinion of *Baronius*, as it seems improbable, so it is opposed by (q) *Petavius*. Our Opinion is, that this Cycle was at that time known, when *Constantine* the Emperor had need of Money to pay off his Soldiers, and renew the War against *Licinius*; but this Æra of Indictions was made more solemn; because the same seemed to the Christians to be an *Epocha* of their restored Liberty after the Conquest of *Maxentius*.

§. 5. There are commonly reckoned up three sorts of Indictions, whereof the first was called the *Cæsarean*; because the *Cæsars* had respect to it in paying Persons, and signing the Instruments of Causes. This Indiction fell upon the 8th of the *Calends* of *October*, or on the 26th Day of

How many Indictions were there, or are there now in use.

(o) L. 15. de Emend. de Temp. (p) In Manuduct. Chron. (q) L. 11. de doct. Temp.

September; For after Harveſt was over, the time of Autumn was thought moſt proper for paying Tributes. The ſecond was called *Conſtantinopolitanean*, in which they ſigned (as they do at this Day) the more Oriental *Calendars*, as appears from the Briefs of the *Hieremian* Patriarch, and of the *Turco-Græcian Cruſius*. This begins upon the *Calends* of *September*; whence ſome think that its Uſe began when the *Græcians* at the Solemnity of the New Year choſe the Autumn of the firſt Month thereof. *Ambroſius* underſtands one of theſe Indictions, when he thus writes to the Biſhops of *Æmilia*; *This is the firſt Month according to coming out of* Ægypt, *and the Firſt according to the Law, and the Eighth according to our Cuſtom: For the Indiction begins on the Month of* September. The third is called *Pontifical*, or the *Roman*, which begins upon the *Calends* of *January*, and continually follows the 2 former, within 4 Months almoſt. To theſe may be added the *Antiochian*, which (*r*) *Scaliger* by the Authority of *Cauſabon*, and the Patriarch *Ignatius*, certainly determines to the Month of *May*.

Of the reaſon why the Roman *Emperors would have this Cycle of Indictions known to the Common People.*

§. 6. We are commonly wont to preſerve thoſe things which appear uſeful to us. In like manner the *Cæſars*, when at the ſtated times of Indictions, their Treaſuries were encreaſed, ordained that the Character of Indiction ſhould be noted in the publick Inſtruments. Thus we read what the Emperor *Juſtinian* commanded in the 47th *Novella*: *Whence we oblige thoſe who miniſter in Affairs; or where-ever any Acts are performed, and the Notaries who write their Inſtruments in any Form in this great City, and in all other Nations whom God has ſubjected to us, that they thus begin: In the third Year of the Empire*

(*r*) Canon. Iſagog. p. 295.

of

of the most Sacred Emperor Augustus, *&c. and afterwards to name those Consuls which are in that Year; and in the third place, the Indiction, the Month and the Day: So the Time shall be preserved in all Affairs: And these things are to be fixt in Writings for the Memory of the Empire, the Order of the Consulate, and other Observations that may be interposed.*

What it was that the Subjects of the Roman People were to pay'em at the Expiration of this Quindecennial Time.

§. 7. And 'twas not for the sake of Remissions but of collecting Subsidies, that those Indictions were chiefly constituted; but what, and in what Order the Subjects of the *Roman* People were to bring, the Ancients have not remarked. *Elegius Noviomensius Episcopus*, who flourish'd about the middle of the 7th Age in the 2d (*f*) *Hom.* speaks of divers Tributes (as the Moderns after him) according to divers *Lustrums* in which the Cycle of Indictions was finished. In the first *Lustrum* there was a Tribute of Gold collected: In the second, one of Silver; and in the third, one of Brass: And the Annotator upon the 47th *Novella* delivers the manner very different. *Anciently,* (says he) *the* Romans *in every* 15 *Years, received a Tribute from the whole World. In the first* 5 *Years, Iron to make Armour for the* Roman *Soldiers. In the* 2d *Silver, out of which the Soldiers were to be paid their Wages. In the* 3d *Gold which was laid up in the Treasury for the* Roman *Republick.* But since, the Writers of the following Age make mention of this Matter in so different a manner, that we can hardly believe this Tradition.

(*f*) *Sixteen of these Homil. are extant* in Biblioth. Patrum.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Character of the Roman CONSULATE.

1. *The* Roman *Conſulate is a Character wherein two* Roman *Conſuls were named; whence we come to the Knowledge of any thing done in that time.*

Of the reaſon why we mention the Roman *Conſulate among the Characters of the Times.*

§. 1. THE Reaſon of the *Roman* Conſulate being mentioned among the Characters of Times, is becauſe both *Latin* and *Greek* Writers by naming two *Conſuls* were wont to fix the times of things done; and that by a moſt ancient Cuſtom, which *Lucan* intimates while he calls theſe Years *Conſular Years*: And amongſt the *Latins*, *Pacatus* in a Panegyric delivered to *Theodorus* Emperor of *Rome*, ſpeaks remarkably; *A certain Captain is promoted to perform the Diſcipline of Sieges; a Prefect is preferr'd to look after a Province; a Conſul is created to give a Name to the Year*, &c.

Of the time in which the Office, Dignity and Character of a Conſul was firſt in uſe among the Romans.

§. 2. After the Raviſhment of *Lucretia* by the Son of *Tarquinius Superbus*, the *Romans* having aboliſhed the Regal Dignity, created Conſuls to govern the Empire, rather to conſult with, than to domineer over their Liberty, or one *King* two *Conſuls* were created; that if one ſhould prove bad, the other having equal Power might reſtrain him: And 'twas the Pleaſure of the People that they ſhould not enjoy the Empire above one Year, leſt a Continuation of their Power ſhould render them inſolent; but they were always civil, knowing that after one Year they ſhould be deprived of all again *(a)*.

(a) Vide Florus l. 1. c. 9.

§. 3.

§. 3. *Lipsius* (*b*) disputes about this, and those who derive their Name from the End or Design of it; which was to consult and provide for the Citizens. (*c*) Others derive their Name from their *Office*, which is to *consult*; that is, ask the Senate. Others interpret 'em *à judicando*, which, in the sense of *Quintilian* (*d*) is the same thing as *consulendo*; from whence this Proverb, *boni consulas*, i. e. *judices*. But the Judgment of *Lipsius* about this Diversity is, that the first Etymology is more popular, the third more subtle, the middle more true; because 'twas the Business of a Consul to interrogate and refer to the Senate; as *Livius* (*e*) hath written; 'twas his part to enquire into their Judgment. *Cicero* (*f*) also says, Let there be two in the Regal Empire, and let 'em be called *Prætors*, *Judges*, *Consuls*, *à Præcundo*, *Judicando*, *Consulendo*: Let 'em have the chief Power of the *Militia*: Let 'em obey no *one*: Let the Safety of the People be their Supreme Law, *&c.*

What it is we ought to understand by the Name and Office of Consuls.

§. 4. As to the time of the Year the Consuls began, we find great Variation according to the Diversity of Times, which does not a little disturb Universal History; we shall alledge some from *Dionysius Halicarnassæus* and *Livius*. First of all therefore, who is he that cannot gather from the Character of the (*g*) *Regifugium* held on the 6th of the *Calends* of *March*, that the Election of *Consuls* fell upon *February*? For the *Consuls* followed the *Kings*, as is the Common Opinion: The Successors of the first *Consuls* began their Consulate on the Ides of *March*, on the Ides of *May*, on the 3d of the Ides, *Sextil.* on the Ides of *Sextil.* on the Ides of *December*, on

Of the time of the year in which the Roman Consuls undertook the Consulate.

(*b*) De Magistrat. Veteris Romani Popili c. 7. (*c*) Flor. Lib. 1. c. 9. (*d*) Lib. 1. c. 9. (*e*) Lib. 7. (*f*) Lib. 3. de Leg. (*g*) Regifugium *was a Feast amongst the* Romans.

the

the *Calends Sextil.* on the *Calends* of *September*, &c. as is evident from the two Writers abovementioned. At length the Cuſtom obtained, that the *Calends* of *January* were deſtined for the *Conſulate*, leſt the Years of the *Curulean* Magiſtrates, eſpecially the *Conſuls*, ſhould differ from the Civil or Common Years; at which time we dare not ſay, that the Heads of the *Roman* Republick undertook the Affair. 'Tis the Opinion of *Juſtus Lipſius*, that from the Year 598, the (*h*) *Calends* of *January* were ſacred for the Change of the Conſuls: Nor in the Times of (*i*) *Ovid* was it different, as appears from theſe Verſes:

Altera Lætitiæ eſt, nec cedens cauſa priori:
Succeſſor tanti frater honoris erit.
Nam tibi finitum ſummo Gracine Decembri
Imperium Jani ſuſcipit ille die.

And in (*k*) another Place,

Jamque novi præeunt faſces, nova purpura fulget,
Et nova conſpicuum purpura ſentit Ebur.

In like manner alſo *Lucan*;

Inſtabátque dies qui dat nova nomina Faſtis,
Quique colit primus ducentem tempora Janum.

Of the time that the Conſuls remained in their Office.

§. 5. The *Conſulate* ordinarily continued a Year; though ſome think 'twas more than the Common Year; and although the *Roman* People conferred upon *Africanus* a continual Conſulate; yet ſome Examples break not a General Rule: For the *Conſulate*, (as ſay

(h) Epitome Liviana, c. 47. (i) Lib. 4. de Pont. Eleg. 9. v. Faſtorum l. 1.

(*l*)

(*l*) *Seneca*) *was an Annual Honour*; or as (*m*) *Tertullian* has it, *the fleeting Joy of one Year.*

Of the number of Conſuls that yearly preſided over the Roman People.

§. 6. There were ordinarily two *Conſuls*, extraordinarily ſometimes more, one of the two dying, or being removed at the Pleaſure of the *Cæſars*: For thus *Julius Obſequens* ſpeaks of thoſe that were removed; *'Tis evident that no one that had taken away the Office of his Colleague lived a Year.* And (*n*) *Lampridius*, ſpeaking of thoſe that were unduly elected, ſays, *For then 1ſt there were 25 Conſuls choſen for one Year, all the Provinces were ſold*, &c. And of Extraordinary *Conſuls Seneca* thus writes; *He made me a* Conſul, *but not an ordinary one*, &c. Alſo *Suetonius* (o) *in ſix Conſulates he had but one that was Ordinary.* And *Suetonius* ſeems to refer to this in his Obſervations of the Emp. *Auguſtus*, he alſo required that *ſo often as a Conſulate was given to him, he ſhould have two Colleagues*: And adds, *Yet all crying out againſt him, he could not obtain that the Majeſty ſhould be leſſened; becauſe he bore that Honour not himſelf alone, but in Conjunction with the other.*

Of the Certainty that may be attained from the Series of Conſuls, and the Signature of the Times.

§. 7. Thoſe that anciently wrote of the *Roman* Affairs, were wont to note diligently that there were two Conſuls, which acted for the ſpace of four Years, as is evident from *Cuſpinianus*'s Monument, which four Years they called *Chronica Conſularia*; but we cannot be ſo happy as to conſult theſe *Conſularia* of the Conſuls, ſince time has wholly deſtroyed theſe ancient Writings, or miſerably defaced 'em: but 'tis thus that (*p*) ſome would make good this Defect: And firſt of all, the *Capitoline* Marbles diſcovered in the laſt Age conduce much towards it: For in the Year of Chriſt 1547, (as *Calvi-*

(*l*) Lib. de Ira, c. ult. (*m*) L. de Patien. in fine. (*n*) In vit. Commodi. (*o*) In Domit. (*p*) Dionyſ. Dio Livius, &c.

ſius

sius has it, the Capitoline Tables written formerly out of the Minutes of the Senate by *Verrius Flaccus* the Grammarian, and publickly set up in the *Roman Forum* by the Command of the Emperor *Augustus*; and afterwards being broken in pieces, and dispersed by the Injury of Times, were lost and covered under Ground; by which ancient Guides (found afterwards again) very many Antiquaries have endeavoured to correct the *Roman Fasti* or *Calendars*; but no one has been more successful in those Enquiries than *Onuphrius*, an Acquaintance of the Cardinal *Alexander Farnesius*, to whom these Tables were brought when first found: For he afterwards published at *Venice* the *Roman* Calendars and Triumphs, from the time of *Romulus*, till that of *Charles* V. in the Year 1557; yet the *Alexandrian* Chronicle is not to be wholly neglected, which carries the Name of the *Sicilian* Calendars: For this Book having been taken from amongst the most ancient Writings, was first found in Sicily, being part of the ancient Library of *Jerone Surita*, and sometimes cited by *Scaliger* and *Causabon*. This Book *Antonius Augustinus (Auditor rotæ)* first brought with him into *Italy*: *Fr. Sylburgius* bought it for six Pieces of Gold, and gave it to *Heschelius*, who brought it to the *Augustine* Bibliotheque; from whence it was published by *Matth. Raderus*.

Tost all the Pairs of Consuls for every year since the first Institution of the Consulate answering to the Monuments of Antiquity already cited, do not at this Day appear, nor are now known.

§. 8. Some suspect that a *Lustrum* of 4 Pairs and consequently of 4 Years, was observed in the *Roman* Calendars; for many Years are wont to be reckoned from the Solemnity of the Consuls; which we have already remark'd, were 2. This Defect, it seems, has given the best Writers much Trouble: For, first of all, there are some who think that either the Names of some Consuls were lost, or that there were Dictators

put

put in the room of Conſuls; or that a *Quadrennium* (or Space of Four Years) was managed without Conſuls; which Opinion, not to mention other Difficulties, ſeems to labour under this, *viz.* That it does not ſufficiently appear in what place the new Pairs of Conſuls were inſerted. Alſo the Government of Dictators was half-yearly, nor decreed but by the Conſuls: There are ſome in the ſecond place that gueſs, the Order of Conſuls had reſpect to the Years of the City. I always ſuſpected, and I think not without Grounds (ſays *Onuphrius*) *that four Years were inſerted in the Calendars, either of Dictators without Conſuls, or without either Dictators or Conſuls; becauſe* Livius, *who wrote the Hiſtory of thoſe Times; found no ſuch thing in the Annals whence he made his Hiſtory. Therefore I ſometimes thought that they fixed the Building of* Rome *with* C. Fabius Pictor *in the 29th of the Olympiads, That the Order of Conſuls might anſwer to the Years of the City.* But it ſeems not ſafe to contradict the unanimous Conſent of the beſt Writers. Thirdly and Laſtly, There are ſome who ſeem, not without Grounds, to ſuſpect that from the very corrupt Diſpoſition of the *Romulian* and *Pompilian* Year; and becauſe the Conſuls at that time did enter upon their Office. Therefore theſe Doubts have ariſen.

Scilicet arma magis quam ſydera, Romule, noras,
Curaque finitimos vincere major erat.

§. 9.

What 'tis we ought to think of their Opinion, who are yet perſwaded that there were five Pair of Conſuls in the Conſular Calendar.

§. 9. And as 'twas ſaid before that there were four Pair of Conſuls, ſo we have (*q*) ſome that will have the ſame Calendars to abound with Five Pair of Conſuls: But ſince, what this Author has advanced, as any one may read him if they think it worth the while, is repugnant to Univerſal Hiſtory; and if his Hypotheſis were admitted, it would rather diſturb Chronology, than bring any Light unto it: Beſides, the ſame Authorities he makes uſe of to advance his Hypotheſis, he rejects them in other Places: Therefore we alſo ſhall reject all that he has ſaid upon this Matter.

Of the time that the Dignity of a Conſulate was in uſe amongſt the Romans.

§. 10. The Conſuls were mark'd in the Calendars till the Year of Chriſt 541; but after *Julius Cæſar*, as he himſelf ſpeaks, *Rome* had only the Shadow of a Common-wealth, and only the Names of Conſuls were retained: For then indeed,

Omnia Cæſar erat.

For what betwixt the Affection of Popularity, and (moſtly) by the Counſel of their Authority, the *Cæſars* drew the Conſulate to themſelves, ſometimes uſing Force in it. For ſo *Suetonius* remarks of his *Auguſtus* in theſe Words; *In the twentieth Year of his Age he invaded the Conſulate, moving his Legions after an hoſtile manner towards the City; and having ſent an Embaſſy to treat for him in the Name of the Army; whilſt the Senate delayed,* Cornelius Centurio *the Chief of the Embaſſy throwing open his Cloak, ſhewed him the*

(*q*) Joannes Georgius Herwart ab Hohenburg, Auctor Novæ, veræ, & exactè ad Calculum Aſtronomicum revocatæ Chronol.

Head

Head of his Sword, and was not afraid to ſpeak in the Court, If you will not do it, this ſhall do it. At length, on the 15th Year of *Juſtinian*, in which only *Baſilius* was Conſul, this Order of Conſuls was wholly extinguiſh'd; and after this Year, for 25 of the following Years they wrote thus: *After the 1ſt, 2d, 3d, &c. Years of the Conſulate of* Baſilius. Thus the Character of the Conſuls fell, and the Times in the *Roman* Affairs were noted with the Years of the Emperors, and a little after with the Years of Chriſt.

The Reaſon why Juſtinian *the Emperor took away the Dignity of the Conſulate from the Senate.*

§. 11. Cuſtom at laſt obtained, that upon the 1ſt Day of the Conſulate, the new Conſuls were uſed to exceſſive Expences; *Ceſar*, therefore as appears from the 105th *Novella*, endeavoured to reſtrain them by a certain Law, in which he not only forbid that they ſhould throw Gold about, but in general that they ſhould not do any thing ſo immenſe and irregular: But when the Conſuls again ambitiouſly violated theſe Limits, the Emperor preſcribed, ſo that upon this Account they often ruined their Families, and reduced them to extream Neceſſity the Conſular Dignity was taken away from the Senate: after that the Name of the Conſuls, which had almoſt continued 1000 Years, was extirpated, and the Republick of *Rome* began to fail, as *Juſtinian* ſpeaks in the *Novella* above cited.

The End of the Second Book.

OF

OF THE *Most Celebrated Periods.*

BOOK III.

CHAP. I.

Of the Period of Calippus.

DEFINITIONS.

1. *The* Calippic Period *is a Syſtem of* 76 *years as well Lunar as Solar; which being elapſed, the Reckoning of the Solar and Lunar Motion recurrs, as at firſt, the Ancients thought that when this Period was finiſhed, the Conjunctions of the Sun and Moon happened again upon the ſame Day of the Solar as they were obſerved to have done before.*
2. *This Sum of Years ariſes by the Multiplication of* 19 *(the* Metonic Cycle) *into* 4.
3. *This* Calippic Period *comprehends* 58 *Common Years, and* 28 *intercalatory Ones,* 940 *Lunations, and* 27759 *Days.*

Of the Reaſon and Occaſion of the Calippic Period, *or a Syſtem of ſo great a time.*

§. 1. THE *Greeks* being adviſed by their Oracle that they ought to ſacrifice as well by Lunæ-Solar Times, as by Days, Months and Years, after various manners

ners of Cycles, as that of 2, 4, 8, 12, Years ſpace; in which they committed great Miſtakes, the Moon, (as we have it in *Ariſtophanes*) complaining out of the Clouds that the *Athenians* had no conſideration to the Lunar Motions: At length *Meto* thought of the 19 years Cycle, and publiſhed the ſame at *Athens* in the 86th year of the 4th Olympiad; ſo that the *Metonic* Cycle was in the 1ſt year of the 87th *Olympiad*, or the 4282d. of the *Julian* Period. Of him *Diod. Sic.* thus writes, *That when* Boſphorus K. *of the* Spartans *was dead, and* Seleucus, *who reigned only four years, ſucceeded him, there was one* Meto, *Brother of* Pauſanias *at* Athens, *famous for* Aſtronomy; *who on the 13th day of* Scirrophorion (*an* Attic Month) *publiſhed his* Enneadecaterides; *for in ſo many years the Stars return to the ſame Places, and as it were, finiſh a great Year: Therefore this Year is by ſome called* Meto's Year; *for that Man ſeems to have followed the Truth in this Prediction and Deſcription: For the Stars have their Motions and Significations anſwerable to this Deſcription: So that very many of the* Greeks *who follow this Account, even to this time ſeem not to have erred.* But ſince the Obſervations of ſucceeding Times have ſufficiently ſhewed us that this *Metonic Cycle* does not exactly anſwer to the Lunæ-Solar Motions. *Calippus* endeavoured to reform it by a new Period, ſubtracting one Day from every 4 Cycles.

§. 2. *Calippus Cyzicenus* of *Myſia*, as he is called by the Ancients, not *Cygicenus*, as 'tis read in *Joſephus Blancanus*'s Chronology of famous Mathematicians. Yet though this Period had its Name from *Calippus*, yet 'tis without doubt, but *Timochares*, *Ariſtillus*, *Polemarchus*, who all flouriſhed about that time, conſulted the Author of this Syſtem; and whereas we read that he came with *Polemarchus* to

That Calippus Cyzicenus *was the Author of this new Period.*

Ariſtotle at *Athens* upon Account of ſome Opinions of *Eudoxus*, *Ariſtotle* in his 62d Metaph. Text. 47. makes mention of this *Calippus*.

Of the time when Callippus his Period began.

§. 3. The Period of *Calippus* began in the Summer of that Year that *Alexander the Great* conquered *Darius* in a difficult Battle at *Arbela*, which was in the 3d Year of the 112th Olympiad, or in the Year of the *Julian* Period 4384. which is manifeſt from (*a*) *Ptolemy*, who brings 4 Obſervations from *Timocharis* at certain years of the firſt *Calippic* Period.

Of the Order of Intercalatory Years to be obſerved in the Calippic *Period.*

§. 4. 'Twas ſaid above that *Calippus* intercalated 18 times in the ſpace of 76 Years; but upon what Account, and in what time he has inſerted thoſe Months, would ſeem difficult, if *Geminus* had not noted that *Calippus* in his new Period had changed nothing in the computing of Intercalation in the *Metonic* Cycle: From whoſe Teſtimony we gather that *Calippus* intercalated ſo often as *Meto*'s Cycle required: But we have above ſhew'd that *Meto*'s Intercalatory Years were 3. 6. 8. 11. 14. 17. 19. Moreover, the firſt Year of the *Calippic* Period was the 8th in the *Metonic* Cycle, which we gather from the ſpace of 102 Years, betwixt the Beginning of *Meto*'s Cycle (in the Year of the *Julian* Period 4282) and the *Calippic* Period (in the Year of the *Julian* Period 4384:) Therefore it ſeems probable to us that the intercalatory Years of the *Calippic* Period were theſe following: 1. 4. 7. 10. 12. 15. 18. 20. 23. 26. 29. 31. 34. 37. 39. 42. 45. 48. 50. 53. 56. 58. 61. 64. 67. 69. 72. 75.

That the Calippic Period does not exactly agree to the Appointment of the Laws of Nations.

Seventy ſix Solar Tropic Years, allowing 365 D. 5 H. 48′, 40″, to a Year, make 27758 D. 9 H. 57′, 40″; but the Days in 940 Lu-

(*a*) Lib. 7. Almag. c. 3.

nations

nations are 27758 D. 18 H. 7′, 0″, supposing the Quantity of one Lunation to be 29 D. 12 H. 44′, 3″, the Sum of 27759 Days are attributed to one Cycle, which agrees with neither of the other, being less than one by almost 10 Hours, and less than another by above 18 H. But that the Examination of the Cycles and Lunæ-Solar Periods may be liable to less Difficulties, we have thought fit to construct the following Tables, whose Use is very great and obvious.

I. Tab. For Solar Tropic Years.

Y. Sol. Trop.	Days.	H.	′	″
1	365	5	48	55
2	730	11	37	50
3	1095	17	26	45
4	1460	23	15	40
5	1826	5	4	35
6	2191	10	53	30
7	2556	16	42	25
8	2921	22	31	20
9	3287	4	20	15
10	3652	10	9	10
20	7304	20	18	20
30	10957	6	27	30
40	14609	16	36	40
50	18262	2	45	50
60	21914	12	55	0
70	25566	23	4	10
80	29219	9	13	20
90	32871	19	22	30
100	36524	5	31	40
200	73048	11	3	20
300	109572	16	35	0
400	146096	22	6	40
500	182621	3	38	20
600	219145	9	10	0
700	255669	14	41	40
800	292193	20	13	20
900	328718	1	45	0
1000	365242	7	16	40
2000	730484	14	33	20
3000	1095726	21	50	0
4000	1460969	5	6	40
5000	1826211	12	23	20
6000	2191453	19	40	0
7000	2556696	2	56	40
8000	2921938	10	13	20
9000	3287180	17	30	0
10000	3652423	0	46	40

II. Tab. For *Julian* Mean Years.

Y. *Jul.*	Days.	Hours.
1	365	6
2	730	12
3	1095	18
4	1461	0
5	1826	6
6	2191	12
7	2556	18
8	2922	0
9	3287	6
10	3652	12
20	7305	0
30	10957	12
40	14610	0
50	18262	12
60	21915	0
70	25567	12
80	29220	0
90	32872	12
100	36525	
200	73050	
300	109575	
400	146100	
500	182625	
600	219150	
700	255675	
800	292200	
900	328725	
1000	365250	
2000	730500	
3000	1095750	
4000	1461000	
5000	1826250	
6000	2191500	
7000	2556750	
8000	2922000	
9000	3287250	
10000	3652500	

III. Tab. For Lunations.

Lunat.	Days.	Hours.	′	″
1	29	12	44	3
2	59	1	28	6
3	88	14	12	9
4	118	2	56	13
5	147	15	40	16
6	177	4	24	19
7	206	17	8	22
8	236	5	58	25
9	265	18	36	28
10	295	7	20	31
20	590	14	41	3
30	885	22	1	34
40	1181	5	22	6
50	1476	12	42	37
60	1771	20	3	9
70	2067	3	23	40
80	2362	10	44	12
90	2657	18	4	43
100	2953	1	25	15
200	5906	2	50	30
300	8859	4	15	45
400	11812	5	41	0
500	14765	7	6	15
600	17718	8	31	30
700	20671	9	56	45
800	23624	11	22	0
900	26577	12	47	15
1000	29530	14	13	30
2000	59061	4	25	0
3000	88591	18	37	30
4000	118122	8	50	0
5000	147652	23	2	30
6000	177183	13	15	0
7000	206714	3	27	30
8000	236244	17	40	0
9000	365775	7	52	30
10000	295305	22	5	0

CHAP. II.

Of the Period of Hipparchus.

1. Hipparchus's *Period is a Syſtem of* 304 *years Lunar and Solar, which being elapſed, the Ancients thought the Reckoning by the Lunar Motion would exactly coincide again with the Solar ones.*
2. *This Period comprehends* 3760 *Months, and* 111035 *Days.*
3. *The Sum of theſe Days ariſes from the Multiplication of the* Calippic *Period,* viz. 27759 *into* 4, *ſubtracting Unity from the Product.*

§. 1. THIS is the Author that corrected the Computation of *Calippus*, and thought of a new one: His Name was *Hipparchus* of *Nicæa* in *Bithynia*, (according to *Strabo*) or the Iſland of *Rhodes* (according to *Ptolemy*;) and he made ſuch Proficiency in *Aſtronomy*, that (*a*) *Pliny* ſays of him, *Nunquam ſatis landatus*. But whether this was the ſame with another famous Aſtronomer, who was called *Abrahis* or *Abrachis*, according as *Lucas Gauricus* and *Joſephus Blancanus* thought, you may read *Clavius*'s (*b*) Diſputations, *Of the Author of this Cycle.*

§. 2. The Age of this Aſtronomer is ſufficiently fixed from his own Obſervations; for he takes notice of a Vernal Æquinox in the 3d Year of the 150th Olympiad, that it happened *Of the time that* Hipparchus *lived and publiſhed his Period.*

(*a*) Lib. 2. c. 26. (*b*) Vide Comment. ad Joan. de Sacroboſco Sphæram.

ned upon the 30th of *Meſſori*, which is *October* the 3d. of the *Jul.* Period 4552; and on the following Years he gives us other Obſervations; whereof *Ptolemy* mentions 8; and the difference betwixt the firſt and the laſt, is 34 Years: Therefore he flouriſhed in the time of the third Punic War; and he gave himſelf up to this Study from the Year 4552, to the Year 4586, according to the *Julian* Account; in which time 'tis indiſputable but he muſt have fixed his Period.

Of the Reaſon why Hipparchus *corrected the* Calippic *Period.*

§. 3. He found that the Period of *Calippus* was aſſumed too great by near a Quarter of an Hour; ſo that 4 Periods being elapſed, the Moon would come to the old Place again in the Solar Calendar, if one Day were ſubtracted; which he accordingly did. Of this Affair *Longomontanus* (*c*) thus writes: Meto *in* 304, *which hapned nearly betwixt him and* Hipparchus, *had committed an Error of* 5 *Days, in his Cycle then, becauſe he look'd upon the Solar Year to be almoſt* 365 ¼ *Days; becauſe he found the Conjunction of the* Sun *and* Moon *not ſo preciſe as it ſhould be, which* Calippus *thought of, whilſt examining an Eclipſe of the* Moon 6 *years before the Death of* Alexander the Great; *So that he corrected* Meto, *ſubtracting one Day in every* 4 *Cycles; from whence he made his own Period of* 76 *Years: But whereas* Calippus *himſelf had uſurped, that the Solar Year conſiſted of* 365 ¼ *Days; and alſo in the Courſe of the* Moon *it loſt ſomething. Therefore* Hipparchus *in like manner corrected* Calippus, *taking from him in* 4 *Periods or the ſpace of* 304 *Years, one whole Day, and conſequently* 5 *from* Meto *in that time.* But this Error of one Day committed by *Calippus Hipparchus* rejected for a whole Solar Year,

(*c*) Danic. Theor. l. 1. c. 2. p. 175.

ſub-

ſubtracting only ſo much after 304 years and one Day altogether in 304 years. Hence it comes to paſs that the Meaſure of the Tropick Year 365 ¼ Days is leſſened by *Hipparchus* by the 300th part of one Day; that is, 4′. 48″: So that time ſhould, according to him, be thought but 365 D. 5 H. 55′. 12″.

That Hipparchus did not follow in his Period what he thought of in his mind.

§. 4. For if according to the Rule of the preceding Tables, you examine this Period, 304 Solar Tropical Years make 111033 D. 15 H. 50′. 40″. But 3760 Lunations make 111035 D. 0 H. 37′. 24″. So that there remains an evident Diſparity, and the Error is owing to this, that the Quantity of the Solar Year was aſſumed greater than the conſtant Account of the Solar Motions require.

That the Authors of the Gregorian Calendar have not rightly corrected the Fault of Hipparchus' Period.

§. 5. The *Gregorian* Hypotheſis is this, that the Sun and Moon are not together in the ſame Place of 304 years as *Hipparchus* had taught, but after 312; which Cycle of Years the *Gregorian* Correctors have ſubſtituted inſtead of that of *Hipparchus*, hereby acting abſurdly two ways: Firſt, the Authors of this Cyclic Method have taken away from this Lunar Cycle worſe than any before them and without any reaſon have deduced their Reckoning rather from Cycles than Computation: 2dly, nor have they rightly obſerved the Laws of the Celeſtial Motions; for which way ſoever you calculate, you ſhall never make 312 Solar Years, and 312 Lunar Years, that they ſhould exactly coincide with a conſtant perpetual Revolution.

How the Errors of the Ancients have been corrected by Lunæ-Solar Calculations.

§. 6. Thoſe who undertake to correct the Lunæ-Solar Cycles and other Periods of the ſame nature, ſeem to me not very unlike thoſe who take up Water in a Sieve; for both of 'em loſe their Labour: We cannot ſucceſsfully find the Lunæ-Solar Motions except by Tables built

built upon Celeſtial Obſervations, whereby we fully know the Times of the Æquinoxes, the Varieties of the Lunar *Phaſes*, coming this way only to the *Archives* of the Stars; when thoſe that have declined this way, and endeavouring to ſubſtitute another Period in the room of that of *Hipparchus*, could never have another Recompence, but Errors for their Errors: So that the Pope himſelf was once amazed when he ſaw the *Jews*, the Slayers of Chriſt, his Colleagues in the Paſchal. So that *Chriſtophorus Clavius* was compelled to write, to the Eternal Infamy of the reformed and ancient Periods: *Demonſtrandum erit* Mæſtlino *in Kal. Greg. alios errores præter quatuor reperi.* Oh the Folly of the Age! Pray, how many Full Moons, Paſchals (for 'twas for their ſakes that ſo much Pains were taken, partly in mending, partly in conſtituting a-new the Periods of the Ancients) could thoſe little Paraſites, while they were nouriſhed 10 Years at *Rome* by *Gregory*, be able to compute with a little diligence for the Tables of Celeſtial Motions, without the uſe of fallacious Cycles and Periods! So that they were able to avoid many Errors, of which *Clement* VIII. wrote fooliſhly enough, when he ſaid, *vitari non potuerint.* In ſhort, there is no Cycle, no Period, however ingeniouſly contrived, which we can pronounce ſufficient to reconcile the Motions of the Sun and Moon by an accurate, uſeful and perpetual Agreement.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Of the Victorian *Period.*

1. *The* Victorian *Period is a Syſtem of* 532 *Luna-Solar and* Julian *Years, which being elapſed, the Characters of the* Moon *fall again upon the ſame Day and* Feria, *and revolve in the ſame Order, according to the Opinion of the Ancients.*
2. *'Tis otherwiſe the great Paſchal Cycle; becauſe the Chriſtians firſt uſed it to find the true time of the* Paſcha's.
3. *But the Sum of theſe Years ariſes from the Multiplication of* 29 *into* 28, *the Numbers of the Lunar and Solar Cycle.*

§. 1. THO' there were many *Victorius*'s by Name, as *Victorius Pictavienſis*, who ſuffered Martyrdom under *Diocleſian*, and another about the Year of Chriſt 324, who in a *Roman* Synod met in *Trajan*'s Baths, was condemned becauſe he preſumed to argue about the Paſchal Cycles received into the Church: But the Learned agree, that one *Victorius* different from the former, and by Nation, an *Aquitane*, was the Author of the Cycle of 532 Years. *Theophilus* and *C. Cyrillus* computed the times of the *Paſcha*'s for only 95 Years: For *Dionyſius Exiguus* remarks upon both, and wrote thus to *Petronius* the Biſhop; *That Pope* Theophilus *dedicating a Courſe of* 100 *Years to Prince* Theodoſius *the Elder, and S.* Cyrillus *compoſing a Cycle of Times for* 95 *Years, both kept in all things this Tradition of the holy Council, to obſerve the* 14 Paſchal

Of the Author of this Period.

Paſchal Moons. When therefore *Hilary* I. Archdeacon, after *Pontifex R.* had obſerved that thoſe Particulars were found out, and that the Table of *Theophilus Alexandrinus* was almoſt at an End, he commanded *Victorius*, who at that time was lookt upon as the beſt Computator of the Age, to aſſiſt the Church in this Neceſſity; who for this ſubſtituted the Period I have deſcribed, that the ſame being elapſed, the *Feriæ* and Conjunctions might return and happen again upon the ſame Day.

Of the time of publiſhing this Period.

§. 2. 'Twas before *Hilarius* received the Pontificate that *Victorius* had his Command about this Cycle, which is gathered from an Epiſtle of *Hilarius* to *Victorius*; which ſaid, is now extant in the *Sirmondian Codex*, which has this Inſcription: *Dilectiſſimo, &c. To the moſt beloved, honourable and holy Brother* Victorius, Hilarius, *Biſhop and Arch-deacon of the City of* Rome, *&c.* But till ſome Years were elapſed, and *Hilarius* made Pope, this Cycle was not publiſhed; as appears from the Prologue written to the ſame Pope: *Domino, &c. To* Hilarius *the truly Holy Lord and Pope, venerable in Chriſt, Biſhop of the City of* Rome, Victorius, *&c. Marianus Scotus* ſpeaks the cleareſt of this Matter, who upon the Year 463, writes the following Words: Victorius *upon the Command of P.* Hilary *wrote the Paſchal Cycle of* 532 *Years.*

Of the time that Victorius *fixed his Period.*

§. 3. And *Victorius* fixed his Period, not from the time he firſt diſcovered it, but from the Paſſion of Chriſt, which he makes to be in the Year of the Conſulate of *Ruffus* and *Rebellius*, which Character ſeems to agree with the 29th Year of the common *Æra*.

How Victorius's *Period was accepted.*

§. 4. Yet the Annals of the Ancients witneſs, that *Victor*, a Biſhop of *Capua*, wrote againſt the Faults of the *Victorian* Cycle; and *Beda* ſeems

seems to take his part against *Victorius*. But how *Victorius* was mistaken, is not so evident to us, since we find no Copy at this Day of his Cycle; for that Fragment which *Petavius* (*a*) cites, he himself thinks spurious. But this is certain, that *Dionysius Exiguus* upon the Occasion of *Victorius*'s Period found out a more accurate and newer Paschal Cycle, *viz.* of 525 Years: Who desires to see more of these, may consult (*b*) Authors.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Constantinopolitan *Period.*

1. *The* Constantinopolitan *Period is a System of* 7980 Julian *Years, whereof the first has the Solar Cycle of* 28 *Years, the* 2*d the Lunar of* 19 *Years, the* 3*d the Indiction of* 15 *Years.*
2. *This Sum arises from the continual Multiplication of the Number of Years in the Solar Cycle, Lunar Cycle and Indiction.*
3. *The* Greeks *do not reckon the same Cycles as the* Romans *do.*
4. *The first Solar Cycle of the* Greeks *is the* 18*th of the* Latines, *and the* 1*st of the* Latines *is the* 12*th of the* Greeks.
5. *The* 1*st Lunar Cycle of the* Greeks *is the* 4*th of the* Latines, *and the* 1*st of the* Latines *is the* 17*th of the* Greeks.
6. *But for the most part, they reckon the Cycle of the Indictions as the* Romans *do: For what Number the* Greeks *give to the Cycle of In-*

(*a*) De Doctrina Temp. Lib. 2. Cap. 67. (*b*) Gennadius de Viris illustribus, c. 8. Isidorus Epist. l 6. c. 17. Scal. Mar. Baron. & Petav.

di-

dictions from the Calends of September, *the same the* Romans *give from the Calends of* January.

Of the Original of the common Græcian Æra, *and in what sense the* Greeks *understood it.*

§. 1. ALtho' we dare not assert with *Josephus* (*a*) *Scaliger* that the *Constantinopolitan* Computation was a Period merely artificial, *which the Unlearned that followed, fetched from the Creation of the World with the same Unskilfulness as the* Jews *do their Reckoning*; Yet the Number of the *Greek* Version of the 70 Interpreters do very nearly agree with this *Æra*: Nor hath it been denied by (*b*) *Petavius*, that this was the Reason of preferring the Conveniency of certain Cycles, chiefly that of the Moon and Indictions, to others, which were to be interpolated by the *Greeks*, and that especially which we now use; which Cycles that they might commodiously agree, the *Greeks* studied to follow *Panodorus Monachus*, or some other Author; by a Subtraction or an Addition of a few Years to that old and well-known Sum: So that nothing hinders why we should less call that Computation a Period which the *Greeks* call by the Name of an *Epocha* or *Æra* (the Commodity and Disposition of the Cycles in the Computation being considered) for by that Name (*viz.* Period) we take notice that not only *Scaliger*, but also *Langius* and others used to call that Computation, tho' 'twas afterwards opposed by *Petavius*.

Of the Use of the Constantinopolitan Epocha or Period.

§. 2. The Use of this Epocha is very great, when at *Constantinopolis* and *Alexandria* they make both use of it for noting their Kalendars;

(*a*) Lib. 5. de Emend. Temp. p. 363. (*b*) L. 9. de doct. Temp.

whence

whence the ſame *Æra* is called by both their Names. (c) *Leo Allatius* doubts not to call it the *Calculation of the whole* Eaſtern Church, *which is almoſt every where ſolemn, and which all make uſe of not only for the direction of the times, and ſhowing the ſolemn Days of their Calendars, but in their Trades and familiar Converſations.*

§. 3. The *Græcian* Year was two-fold, firſt Civil, which they began with the Indiction from *September*; 2d, the Eccleſiaſtic, which they began from the Cycle of the Sun and Moon from *April*. Hence the Computations of theſe years divided by the Cycle of the Sun and Moon, are to be leſſened by Unity in the former Months, which, as *Petavius* notes, *Scaliger* had not conſidered. *Of the Beginning of the Græcian Years.*

§. 4. The 1ſt year of Chriſt in relation to this Period may be ſhewn from many Examples of Authors which uſed the *Conſtantinopolitan Æra*: As for Example, by *Iſaac Argyrus*, it is gathered that the firſt Year of the vulgar *Æra* began on the 4th Month of the Year 5509; whence it's evident that betwixt the beginning of this *Epocha*, and that of the vulgar *Æra*, there were 5508 Years and 4 Months, which, if added to the Year of the Chriſtian *Æra*, it ſhews the time according to the *Greek* Account; or if ſubtracted from the time of the *Conſtantinopolitans*, it ſhews the time anſwering to our vulgar Computation: ſo that there is no uſe of thoſe large Tables invented by *Leo* (d) *Allatius*. *Of the firſt Year of Chriſt in relation to this Period, and how other Years of Chriſt are to be conſidered with the Years of this Æra.*

§. 5. And from the Sum of the Years and Months reckoned according to the *Greeks*, ſubtract 795 Years, 4 Months, and the Remainder is the Time anſwering in the *Julian* Account; or if you add to the *Julian* Years and *How the Græcian Years are to Julian.*

(c) De Dominicis & Hebdomadibus Græcorum. (d) Lib. de Dominicis & Hebdomadibus.

Months

All the Greek Writers did not make use of this Computation.

Months the 795 Years 4 Months, you have the *Grecian* Year.

§. 6. Although at this Day many of the *Greeks* make use of this *Æra*; yet there are others especially amongst the ancient Writers, that use another *Epocha* different from this; whence *Jacobus* (e) *Capellus* reckons upon divers *Æra's* which are distinctly made use of by the *Greek* Writers. The first is, if you look back to the Creation of the World, according to the Reckoning of the *Latines*, the *Constantinopolitan* Reckoning just now explained, will be found false: The 2d is the *Græc. Æra*, us'd by the *Æthiopians*, which begins the 9th Year from the *Alexandrian* or *Constantinopolitan Æra* upon the 9th Indiction, and the 26th *Julian* Solar Cycle, and commences upon the Autumn: The third also is a *Grecian Æra* frequently used by *Cedrenus*. He deduces it from the 16th year of the *Alexandrian Epocha*, the 8th of the *Æthiopian*, and from the first Indiction: The fourth is that which *Maximus Manachus* usurps, and is deduced from the 17th Year current of the common *Græcian Æra*; for betwixt the Epocha of the World's Creation, and the Year of Christ, *Maximus* reckons 5492 Years. *Petavius* reckons up the Varieties of the *Greek* Computations after another manner, who in respect to *Dionysius's* Christian *Æra*, admits only two *Æra's* of the *Greeks*, whereof the first makes the Nativity of Christ upon the 5493d Year of his *Æra*; the other upon the Year 5509; about which (f) *Petavius* may be consulted.

How the Greek and Latin Cycles may be compared.

§. 7. The *Latin* and *Greek* Cycles may be compared by Help of the following Table, which shews the Lunar and Solar Cycles of both

(e) In Epocham illustrium themat. (f) L. 9. de doct. temp.

both: For we have already ſhewn how the *Latin* Cycle of Indictions agrees with the *Græcian* Cycles; to which we may add that the *Græcian* Cycles anſwer to the *Latin* Cycles till *March* or *April*: If therefore the Character of the following Months in relation to the Solar Cycle of the *Latins*, anſwering to the reckoning of the *Greeks* be ſought, the Tabular Numbers in the Column *Græc.* ought to be encreaſed by Unity. Indeed I am not ignorant that *Iſaac Monachus* wrote that the Year, in reſpect of the Solar Cycle, began from *October*; but in reſpect of the Lunar Cycle, from the *Calends* of *January*; but if we conſider the uſual *Greek* Computations, that Method we have now preſcribed, will be more natural.

Solar Cycle.		Lunar Cycle.	
LAT.	GRÆC.	LAT.	GRÆC.
1	12	1	17
2	13	2	18
3	14	3	19
4	15	4	1
5	16	5	2
6	17	6	3
7	18	7	4
8	19	8	5
9	20	9	6
10	21	10	7
11	22	11	8
12	23	12	9
13	24	13	10
14	25	14	11
15	26	15	12
16	27	16	13
17	28	17	14
18	1	18	15
19	2	19	16
20	3		
21	4		
22	5		
23	6		
24	7		
25	8		
26	9		
27	10		
28	11		

CHAP. V.

Of the Julian Period.

1. *The* Julian *Period is a Syſtem of* 7980 *Years, whoſe firſt Year had* 1 *for the Character of the Solar Cycle; alſo of the Lunar Cycle, and alſo of the Indiction, all reckoned according to the manner of the* Latines, *from Noon upon the Calends of* January.
2. *This Period ariſes from the continual Multiplication of* 28, 19, *and* 15, *the Cycles of the Sun, Moon and Indiction.*
3. *In reſpect of its Uſe, this Period contains in it the Reaſon of all other* Epocha's; *ſo that we are chiefly to reduce all other Æra's to it.*

§. 1. THIS Period was not called the *Julian*, because it was invented by *Julius Cæſar*, ſince 'twas not received till the Year 4669; but becauſe this Syſtem conſiſts of *Julian* Years. *Of the reaſon why this is called the* Julian *Period.*

§. 2. This Epocha is not Hiſtorical but Artificial, ſince 'twas invented only for the Uſe of true Epocha's: For *Scaliger* conſidering that the Calculation was very intricate, ſince, if we conſider the Years of the Creation, the year of Chriſt, or any other Epocha whatever, another Perſon could not underſtand what Year this or that Writer meant; therefore to remove ſuch Doubts about reckoning upon the times, he thought of this Period; and when he ſaw that there was no other Epocha, whoſe Beginning was inconteſtable among Chronologers, he fixed this: For he continually multiplied the *Of its Author.*

three Cycles of the Sun, Moon, and Indiction together, and the Product resulting he called the *Julian* Period. By this means, avoiding those Inconveniencies, which were wont to arise from the different Computation of Years; but no one can doubt, who has considered the 2 Periods, *viz.* the *Constantinopolitan* and the *Julian*; but that the former was the occasion of the latter. For they agree in Quantity and in Principles; since, as *Scaliger* has taught, both arise from the Multiplication of the Cycles; but they disagree in respect of the *Terminus à quo*, since the Beginning of the *Const.* Period is supposed to precede the other Period by 795 years: Nor have the Years of the *Julian* Period the same Beginning as the *Const.* have; since we begin those from Noon upon the Calends of *January*; but these partly from the Autumn, partly from the Spring. But what Praise *Scaliger* has deserved, even from his Enemy, because of the Use of this *Julian* Period, is evident from the following Words of (a) *Petavius*, where he says, *Truly there is scarce any thing in all* Scaliger's *Chronological Books which is of any Moment, or may avoid Reprehension, besides his Explication of the* Julian *Period. And as we have deservedly, condemn'd the rest, and because of their intolerable Errors, and have rejected them from all Use in History; so we ought much to esteem this Artificial Cycle of Year and its Use.* Which is sufficient from an Enemy and constant Adversary.

Of the most remarkable Uses of the Julian *Period.*

§. 3. The first Use of the *Julian* Period is this; that we can explain our Minds to one another: For every Year of this Period has its Cycles; all of which no other Year in the whole Period has. And on the contrary, the

(a) Lib. 9. Cap. 1.

Year

Year of the Creation being ſtated, we may firſt enquire how many years any Author reckons from the Creation to the Year of Chriſt which *Multiplex* Inquiſition, Experience will teach any one who doubts of it, is troubleſome and full of Difficulties, according to the Method of other Periods. The 2d Uſe is, that the 3 Cycles are found in this Period: The 3d Uſe is this, that if it can be found how the Chronological Characters can be found, and that the Years of any other Epocha can be connected with the years of the *Julian* Period, the ſame Characters alſo with little Labour may be applied to the years of all other Epocha's, which alſo is the Cauſe why we ſhall explain in certain Sections the Invention of the Chronological Characters in the *Julian* Period, and afterwards in particular, the Connexion of Hiſtorical Years, with the *Julian* Period. For whereas in all other Chapters we have particularly ſpoken how thoſe Characters might peculiarly be applied to *Æra's*: So it ſhall be ſufficient that we have mentioned how they may be compared together in the *Julian* Account; ſo that it only remains, that in the mention of Epocha's we only ſhew how all the Years reckoned from any Period agree with ſome certain year in the *Julian* Period.

Of the Principle that Scaliger followed in inſtituting the Years of the Julian Period.

§. 4. The firſt Year of *Dionyſius*'s Chriſtian Epocha by the conſent of all the *Latines*, had for its Characters 10, the Solar Cycle; 2. the Lunar, 4. the *Roman* Indiction; which three Cycles being found in no other year of the whole *Julian* Period, beſides 4714, the firſt of the Chriſtian *Æra*: Therefore this *Dionyſian* Epocha muſt rightly agree with that year of the *Julian* Period, and each with each, as *Scaliger* noted, and as *Petavius* truly wrote: *The Beginning of the Years of Chriſt, which*

Men call the Christian Era, is as it were the Limit and Hinge of Chronology, and the common Term in which the Reckoning of all Chronologers meet, as if they are drawn through many Turnings and Windings into the same Computation.

An Enquiry whether the System of the Julian Period is sufficient to assign all the Epochas of the World of all Chronologers.

§. 5. Whereas the first year of the *Julian* Period, reckoning back from the true beginning of the World, is 764; it easily appears, that the disagreeing Opinions for many years may commodiously be referred to the *Julian* Period: Nor is it found amongst those Writers who reckon from the *Hebrew* and *Latin Codices* of Bibles, that ascends the assigned Epocha of the Creation, ascends beyond the beginning of the *Julian* Period. But if we examine the Reasons of profane History, and first of all, of the *Ægyptian* and other Authors, who follow the Numbers of the 70 Interpreters, we cannot deny this Period to be insufficient to reconcile all the Disagreements that happen about the Epocha of all the World's Creation till *Abraham*, the Computation of the *Greeks* exceeds that of the *Latines* by more than a thousand years, as shall be shew'd in its Place; for which reason, besides that we now mentioned, we call the *Julian* Period *Postulatitious*; by means whereof we can commodiously explain those Opinions which differ so much from the *Hebrew* Truth.

The Cycle of the Sun, Moon and Indiction of any Year in the Julian Period being given to find the Dominical Letter, the 1st Feria, and the Quantity of the Year.

§. 6. Let the given Number of years be divided by 28, 19, and by 15, look at the Remainders, not at the Quotients, and we have the Character of the Cycle sought: If nothing remains, 'tis the last of the Cycle sought. Afterwards, the Solar Cycle being known, the Dominical Letter, the first Day of the Year, and the Quantity of the Year, are rea-

readily found from the last Table, Page 130. For easier Computation in this Matter, we have added the following Table.

	Cyc. ☉	Cyc. ☽	Cy. In.	Cyc. Ju.
1	28	19	15	28
2	56	38	30	98
3	84	57	45	147
4	112	76	60	196
5	140	95	75	245
6	168	114	90	294
7	196	133	105	343
8	224	152	120	392
9	252	171	135	441

§. 7. Cast away the Thousands and Hundreds; divide the Remainder by 4: If nothing remains 'tis Bissextile: If 1, 2, or 3 remains, 'tis the common Year, and the 1st, 2d, or 3d after a Bissextile. *How it may be known whether any assign'd Year is Bissextile or Common.*

§. 8. 'Tis necessary by the *Praxis* in the preceding Section to find the first Day in the given Year, and the Quantity of the given Year, if the Day sought be after *February*; which being known, diminish the Sum by 1, and add it to the Number of the Days, from the beginning of *January* inclusive; afterwards divide by 7, and the Remainder shews the Day of the Week. For easier Calculation the following Table is subjoined; wherein the Days for any Number of Months are set down. *How the Character belonging to any given Day in any given Year of the Julian Period may be found.*

In a Year

	Common		Bissextile	
January	D. 31	F. 3	D. 31	F. 3
February	59	3	60	4
March	90	6	91	7
April	120	1	121	2
May	151	4	152	5
June	181	6	182	7
July	212	2	213	3
August	243	5	244	6
September	273	7	274	1
October	304	3	305	4
November	334	5	335	6
December	365	1	666	2

How the Character of the Feria of any Day in a given Year may be found without knowing the Solar Cycle.

§. 9. From the compleat Sum of the *Bissextile* years of Christ, and of the Days of the current Year, subtract Unity; (and for the New Kalendar, besides Unity, the other Days that are to be subtracted) divide the Difference by 7, and the Remainder shews the *Feria* or Day of the Week sought.

How the Dominical Letter, which is otherwise known by the Solar Character in the years of the Julian *Period, may without it be found in the years of Christ.*

§. 10. Observe the Order of the Dominical Letters in the subjoined Scheme:

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7.
A B C D E F G

By 7 divide the Sum of 5, and of the elapsed *Bissextiles* of the Year of Christ (whose Sum is known by dividing the Years of Christ by 4) subtract the Remainder from 8, and you have the Dominical Letter in a *Bissextile* Year to be reckoned from the 6th of the *Calends* of *March*; But in the new Kalendar you first subtract

tract the Number of Days that are to be ſubtracted.

§. 11. Divide the Number of Days elapſed from the *Calends* of *January*, and the Remainder is the Number anſwering to the Letter ſought, putting A for 1, B for 2, &c. *The manner how the Letter anſwering to any Day in any Year of the* Julian *Kalendar may be readily found.*

§. 12. The chief Uſe of this Syſtem of Time is, that we cannot only aſſign the Characters of any given year; but alſo if the Characters be given, we can find the year anſwering. To do the laſt, we ſhall propoſe two ways: The firſt is this; The Number of the years of the Solar Cycle being given, ſubtract from them thoſe of the Lunar (adding 28, if the Subtraction cannot be made with it), multiply the Difference by 56: Again, take the Sum of this Product, and that Number from which the Subtraction was made, and by 532, the Quantity of the *Victorian* Period, you have the year of the *Victorian* Period, the difference betwixt this year, and that of the given Indiction divided by 15, and the Remainder multiplied by 1064; the Sum of the Product of the *Victorian* year found as above (if not exceeding 7980, the Quantity of the *Julian* Period) will give the year ſought. *The Cycle of the Sun, Moon and* Roman *Indiction being given, the correſponding Year in the* Julian *Period may be thus found.*

§. 13. With the Number of the Solar Cycle enter the following Table, and under the Character ☉ take out the anſwering Numbers; as alſo under the Character ☽, take the Numbers anſwering to the Lunar Cycle, divide the Aggregate of theſe by 15, ſubtracting the Remainder from the Number of the given Indiction, add the Difference to the former Aggregate; and againſt the Sum under the Title *Indict.* is the Year of the *Julian* Period ſought. *Or thus.*

Cycl. N.	☉	☽	Indict.
1	57	476	6916
2	114	420	5852
3	171	364	4788
4	228	308	3724
5	285	252	2660
6	342	196	1596
7	399	140	532
8	456	84	7448
9	513	28	6384
10	38	504	5320
11	95	448	4256
12	152	392	3192
13	209	336	2128
14	266	280	1064
15	323	224	7980
16	380	168	
17	437	112	
18	494	56	
19	19	532	
20	76		
21	133		
22	190		
23	247		
24	304		
25	361		
26	418		
27	475		
28	532		

§. 14. Altho' we think that the true Use of this System does abundantly compensate for any Difficulty that can occur, and that nothing could be more proper to remove the intricate Perplexities of Chronologers than an Observance of the clear Disposition and evident Reasons of its Characters, yet there is one thing we cannot pass by; that if any Person is not pleased with the Use of this Period, he may more commodiously use the *Dionysian Æra* of Christ, with the years before it began than any other Epocha whatever: For altho' (a) *Petavius* concludes *Cæcibi, qui hanc Periodum omittent, præsentis illius fructus, ut per singulorum trium Cyclorum summulas divisi annorum numeri Cyclos eorum priorios exhibeant.* But this Difficulty may be removed if one will observe that these Numbers 9, 1, 3, are to be added to the year of Christ forwards, and the Sums to be divided by 28, 19, 15. But if the years should happen to be before Christ; then let the Sums be divided by the Numbers 28, 19, 5, and subtract the Remainders from 10, 2, 4, assuming Circles as oft as is necessary; we have the Characters answering to the year before Christ's Nativity. For Example; to the year of Christ add 4713; or from the year before Christ subtract 4714, the Sum or Difference gives the corresponding year in the *Julian* Period. *Of the Obscurity of the Julian Period.*

§. 15. Whereas the Sabbatic and Jubilean years begin not as the *Julian* do; (for we reckon these from 12 o,a-clock on the Kalends of *January*: But those from the 10th Day of the first Autumnal Month *Tisri* as above) it further appears that any Sabbatic or Jubilean year is concerned with *How to find the Character of the Sabbatic Cycle for the Years of the Julian Period.*

(a) *Petavius* Lib. 1. c. 4.

two

two years of the *Julian* Period, with the first in respect of the 3 Months, the latter in respect of 9. This premised, note that to all the years of the *Julian* Period, considered in respect of the 9, we are to add 6, and divide the Sum by 7, and the Remainder is either 0, and then 'tis a Sabbatic year; if any, it is the Cycle of the Sabbatic year belonging to the year given: But if the same Character be sought in respect of the latter Months of the *Julian* year, omit the Addition of 6, and let the given Sum of years be divided by 7, and you have it as before. But the Rule of *Scaliger* in this (c) Affair is this; *All the Sevens of the Solar Cycle are the 7th Years of the Week*; And therefore what year soever shall happen after the next 7 of the Solar Cycle, that is the first year of the legal Week, &c. is to be understood of the years of the *Julian* Period, considered not in respect of the former but latter Months.

The manner of finding the Character of the Jubilean Cycle in the years of the Jubilean Period.

§. 16. Although in the Opinion of the Mystic Chronologer, the way of finding this Character in the *Julian* Period may seem intricate, since the Quantity of the mystic Jubilean year has nothing common with the Quantity of the *Julian*; yet we shall not deliver a less easie Method of finding the Character of the *Julian* Cycle; and 'tis that whereby we found before the Character of the Sabbatic Cycle; Therefore to any years of the *Julian* Period considered here in respect of the 1st 9 Months nearly, add 20 to the Number of the years of the *Julian* Period, divide the Sum by 49, and the Remainder is either of which always shews the Jubilean year; or else 1, 2. 3, when it shall determine that year

(c) Jul. Ifag. p. 9.

in

in the Jubilean, which the remaining Number expreſſes.

§. 17. The Ancients thought the Solſtices, &c. firſt; and they relate of *Soſygenes*, that he thought that neither in his nor ſucceeding Ages, the Winter Solſtices could happen but upon the *Calends* of *January*. Thus alſo the Fathers in the *Nicene* Council, that the *Vernal Æquinox* cou'd not recede from the 20th or 21ſt of *March*; but the Event ſhews that both were deceived: For 'tis now evident that the Winter Solſtice, with the other Cardinal Times have fallen otherwiſe.

The Cardinal Times of the Æquinoxes and Solſtices are conſtantly applied to certain days of the Julian *Kalendar.*

§. 18. Although very many after different ways, were wont to think of a Method how to find the time of the Æquinoxes and Solſtices; yet we doubt not but ours which follows is moſt compendious, eaſie, certain, and accommodated to Chronological Calculations. The Foundation of it, and firſt of all of the Table, by whoſe Help the Computation is performed, is twofold: Firſt, it's evident that *Tycho Brahe* at *Ween* in the year of Chriſt 1584, obſerved the *Vernal Æquinox* on *March* the 9th, 21 H. 30 M. Afternoon; and that the ſame Day of Obſervation was on a Biſſextile, 70 D. from the *Calends* of *January*; in like manner in the following year 1585, he obſerved the *Vernal Æquinox* to happen on the 10th day of *March*, 3 H. 19 M. and in the year 1586, *March* 10th, 9 H. 8 M. Secondly, (*d*) *Longomontanus* thus determined the Quantity of the Tropic Year: *The Quantity of the Tropic Year* ſays he, *is now more ſubtilly, and with greater diligence obſerved by us than any one before to be* 365 *D.* 5 *H.* 48 *M.* 58 *Sec. the Anticipation being limited and ſubtracted from the Mean of the*

Of finding the time of the Vernal Æquinox.

(*d*) L. 1. Theor. c. 5.

Julian

Julian *Year* 365 *D.* 6 *H.* &c. From these Hypotheses we have constructed the following Table, whose Use is this: At the compleat given Year of the *Julian* Period in which the time of the *Vernal Æquinox* is sought, take out the Numbers of Anticipation, and subtract them from a *Radix* answering to the current year, the time of the *Vernal Æquinox* is known, reckon'd from Noon-day at *Rome*.

The Radix for the Given Year.

	D.	H.	′
Bissextile.	119	8	31
1st after Biss.	117	14	31
2d after Biss.	117	20	31
3d after Biss.	118	2	31

A Table for anticipating the Æquinoctials in Julian *Years according to the Hypotheſis of the* Danish *Aſtronomy.*

Years.	H.	Min.	Years.	Days	Ho.	Min.
1	0	11	100	0	18	28
2	0	22	200	1	12	57
3	0	33	300	2	7	25
4	0	44	400	3	1	53
5	0	55	500	3	20	22
6	1	8	600	4	14	50
7	1	18	700	5	9	18
8	1	29	800	6	3	47
9	1	40	900	6	22	15
10	1	56	1000	7	16	43
20	3	42	2000	15	9	27
30	5	32	3000	23	2	10
40	7	23	4000	30	18	53
50	9	14	5000	38	11	37
60	11	5	6000	46	4	20
70	12	56	7000	53	21	3
80	14	47	8000	61	13	47
90	16	38	9000	69	6	30
100	18	28	10000	76	23	13

§. 19. From the time of the *Vernal Æquinox*, ſubtract 89 D. 5 H. 40 Min. the Remainder is the time of the Winter Solſtice, where you muſt note that in both the preſent and following Ages the Winter Solſtice does not fall upon the mentioned, but the preceding year; and therefore that a Subtraction may be made, the Days

To find the Solſtices.

Days of the preceding year, or at leaſt, of the laſt Month, are to be added to the Sum from whence you ſubtract; but if 93 D. 9 H. 15 M. be added to the time of the ſame *Vernal Æquinox*, the time of the Summer Solſtice is had; to which laſt Sum let 93 D. 9 H. 15 Min. be again added, and you have the time of the *Autumnal Æquinox* ſought; or if immediately you deſire to know the *Autumnal Æquinox* from the *Vernal*, add to that 186 D. 18 H. 30 M. and you have the time of the *Autumnal Æquinox*, which again the following *Æquinox* manifeſts by adding to the time of the *Autumnal* 178 D. 11 H. 19 M. *&c.*

To find the Characters of the mean, new and full Moons in the Julian *Period.*

§. 20. Whereas the Tables which Aſtronomers uſe, begin either from the Epocha of the World, or that of Chriſt; and therefore are not univerſal: Ours ſhall be fitted to the years of the *Julian* Period; whereby we can apply all Chronological Characters to all times. The Uſe of the Tables conſtructed for this end, is this; Let there be taken out under the Title *Rad. P. Jul.* the compleat time propoſed, and let the correſponding *Motions of the Moon's Longitude* be added thereto, computing 60 Minutes to a Degree, 30 Degrees to a Sign, and 12 Signs to a Circle or one whole Period. If then the N. Moon of any Month is ſought, ſubtract the above Addition from 12 Signs or 360 Days; but if a F. Moon, then from ſix Signs, aſſuming a whole Circle to make the Subtraction poſſible, if need be; if nothing remains, the Character of the Moon's Conjunction which is ſought, falls upon the end of the preceding Month; if any thing remains, and that Remainder be 12 D. 11′ 27″, (in which caſe one Day's Addition is neceſſary,) or if greater, enter the 4th *Table* therewith, which is conſtructed for Days, and there ſeek the Remainder, which if it anſwers exactly, 'tis done; *if*

if not, take the next leſs and ſubtract; with the difference enter the 5th *Table of Hours*, and if need be, proceed to Minutes and Seconds. The Sum of all which, is the time to be reckoned from 12 a-clock at *Uranburg*, the beginning of the Month Current: If for other Places, the difference of Longitude in time muſt be added or ſubtracted. But you are to note, 1ſt, That if the propoſed Month be not *January*, you muſt firſt work for the Solar Cycle of the given Year, by which you may know whether theſe Motions being taken out, belong to a Biſſextile or common Year. 2dly, The N. Moon of one Month being known, that of the next is alſo known, by adding 29 D. 12 H. 44 Min. or of the preceding, by ſubtracting ſo much; Wherefore if you take the time of the N. Moon, and want the time of the following F. Moon, add 14 D. 18 H. 22′. to the time of the N. Moon; or if by the given F. Moon you would ſeek out the N. Moon preceding, ſubtract the ſame Sum from the known time of the F. Moon; and from hence the Conjunction of the Luminaries being known for any one Month of the *Julian* Year, they are eaſily found for any other; and for this the Table *Lib.* 3. *C.* 1. will be uſeful.

The First Table of the Mean Lunar Motions for each of the Years in the Julian *Period.*

	Moon's Longit.				*Moon's Latit.*			
	S.	*O.*	*'.*	*''.*	*S.*	*O.*	*'.*	*''.*
Radix P. Jul.	8	10	41	19	4	26	7	11
I	4	21	48	49	5	11	56	31
II	9	1	26	11	10	10	39	17
III	1	11	3	33	3	9	22	3
IV	5	20	40	57	8	8	4	49
V	10	12	29	46	1	20	1	20
VI	2	22	7	9	6	18	44	6
VII	7	1	44	31	11	17	26	52
VIII	71	11	21	53	4	16	9	38
IX	4	3	10	42	9	28	6	9
X	8	12	48	5	2	26	48	55
XI	0	22	25	27	7	25	31	41
XII	5	2	2	50	0	24	14	27
XIII	9	23	51	40	6	6	10	58
XIV	2	3	29	3	11	4	53	44
XV	6	13	6	25	4	3	36	30
XVI	10	22	43	46	9	2	19	16
XVII	3	14	32	35	2	14	15	47
XVIII	7	24	9	57	7	12	58	33
XIX	0	3	47	20	0	11	41	19
XX	4	13	24	43	5	10	24	6

The Second Table for Years collected from the Julian *Period.*

	Moon's Longit.				*Moon's Latitude.*			
YEARS.	*S.*	*O.*	*'.*	*''.*	*S.*	*O.*	*'.*	*''.*
XX	4	13	24	43	5	10	24	6
XL	8	26	49	25	10	20	48	11
LX	1	10	14	8	4	1	12	17
LXXX	5	23	38	50	9	11	36	22
C	10	7	3	33	2	22	0	28
CC	8	14	7	5	5	14	0	56
CCC	6	21	10	38	8	6	1	24
CCCC	4	28	14	11	10	28	1	52
D	3	5	17	44	1	20	2	20
DC	1	12	21	17	4	12	2	47
DCC	11	19	24	49	7	4	3	15
DCCC	9	26	28	22	9	26	3	43
DCCCC	8	3	31	55	0	18	4	11
M	6	10	25	28	3	10	4	39
2 *M*	0	21	10	55	6	20	9	18
3 *M*	7	1	46	23	10	0	13	57
4 *M*	1	12	21	50	1	10	18	36
5 *M*	7	22	57	18	4	20	23	16
6 *M*	2	3	32	46	8	0	27	55
7 *M*	8	14	8	14	11	10	32	34
8 *M*	2	24	43	4	2	20	37	12

The Third Table, for Months of the Common Year.

MONTHS.	Moon's Longit.				Moon's Latitude.			
	O.	S.	′.	″.	O.	S.	′.	″.
January	0	17	54	47	1	20	6	36
February	1	29	15	15	2	0	31	55
March	0	17	10	2	3	20	38	30
April	0	22	53	23	4	27	31	20
May	1	10	48	11	6	17	37	55
June	1	16	31	32	7	24	30	45
July	2	4	26	20	9	14	37	21
August	2	22	21	7	11	4	43	56
September	2	28	4	58	0	11	36	46
October	3	15	59	15	2	1	43	21
November	3	22	42	36	3	8	36	11
December	4	9	37	23	4	28	42	26
Of the Bissextile Year.								
January	0	17	54	47	1	20	6	36
February	0	11	26	41	2	13	45	40
March	0	29	21	29	4	3	52	16
April	1	5	4	50	5	10	45	6
May	1	22	59	37	7	0	51	41
June	1	28	42	58	8	7	44	31
July	2	16	37	45	9	27	51	6
August	3	4	32	32	11	17	57	41
September	3	10	15	53	0	24	50	31
October	3	28	10	41	2	14	57	7
November	4	3	54	2	3	21	49	57
December	4	21	48	49	5	11	56	31

The Fourth Table for Days.

DAYS.	*Moon's Longit.*				*Moon's Latitude.*			
	S.	*O.*	*'.*	*".*	*S.*	*O.*	*'.*	*".*
1	0	12	11	27	0	13	13	46
2	0	24	22	53	0	26	27	31
3	1	6	34	20	1	9	41	17
4	1	18	45	47	1	22	55	3
5	2	0	57	13	2	6	8	48
6	2	13	8	40	2	19	22	34
7	2	25	20	7	3	2	36	20
8	3	7	31	34	3	15	50	5
9	3	19	43	0	3	29	3	51
10	4	1	54	27	4	12	17	37
11	4	14	5	54	4	25	31	22
12	4	26	17	20	5	8	45	8
13	5	8	28	47	5	21	58	54
14	5	20	40	14	6	5	12	39
15	6	2	51	40	6	18	26	25
16	6	15	3	7	7	1	40	11
17	6	27	14	34	7	14	53	56
18	7	9	26	0	7	28	7	42
19	7	21	37	27	8	11	21	28
20	8	3	48	54	8	24	35	13
21	8	16	0	21	9	5	48	59
22	8	28	11	47	9	21	2	44
23	9	10	23	14	10	4	16	30
24	9	22	34	41	10	17	30	16
25	10	4	46	7	11	0	44	1
26	20	16	57	34	11	13	57	47
27	10	29	9	1	11	27	11	33
28	11	11	20	27	0	10	25	18
29	11	23	31	54	0	23	39	4
30	0	5	43	21	1	6	52	50
31	0	17	54	47	1	20	6	35

The Fifth Table for Hours and Minutes.

H.	☽'s Lon. °	'	"	☽'s Lat. °	'	"	☽'s Lon. °	'	"	☽'s Lat. '	"
1	0	30	29	0	33	5	31	15	45	17	5
2	1	0	57	1	6	10	32	16	15	17	38
3	1	31	26	1	39	14	33	16	46	18	11
4	2	1	54	2	12	19	34	17	16	18	44
5	2	32	23	2	45	23	35	17	47	19	18
6	3	2	52	3	18	27	36	18	17	19	51
7	3	33	20	3	51	32	37	18	48	20	24
8	4	3	49	4	24	36	38	19	18	20	57
9	4	34	18	4	57	41	39	19	49	21	30
10	5	4	46	5	30	45	40	20	19	22	3
11	5	35	15	6	3	49	41	20	50	22	36
12	6	5	43	6	36	52	42	21	20	23	9
13	6	36	12	7	9	58	43	21	51	23	42
14	7	6	41	7	43	3	44	22	21	24	15
15	7	37	9	8	16	7	45	22	51	24	48
16	8	7	38	8	49	11	46	23	22	25	21
17	8	38	6	9	22	16	47	23	52	25	54
18	9	8	35	9	55	20	48	24	23	26	28
19	9	39	4	10	28	25	49	24	53	27	1
20	10	9	32	11	1	29	50	25	24	27	34
21	10	40	1	11	34	33	51	25	54	28	7
22	11	10	29	12	7	38	52	26	25	28	40
23	11	40	58	12	40	42	53	26	55	29	13
24	12	11	27	13	13	46	54	27	26	29	46
25	12	41	55	13	46	51	55	27	56	30	19
26	13	12	24	14	19	55	56	28	27	30	52
27	13	42	53	14	53	0	57	28	57	31	25
28	14	13	21	15	26	4	58	29	28	31	58
29	14	43	50	15	59	8	59	29	58	32	31
30	15	14	19	16	32	13	60	30	29	33	4
I.	I.	II.	III.	I.	II.	III.	II.	II.	III.	II.	III.
II.	II.	III.	IV.	II.	III.	IV.					

§. 21.

§. 21. For the given time of Conjunction under the Title *Radix P. Jul.* take out the corresponding Numbers under *Motus Latitudinis Lunæ*, and let the Numbers thus found be added together; and let the Signs multiplied by 30 be changed into Degrees and added to the reſt if any. Further, note that by frequent Obſervations Aſtronomers gather, that the Solar Eclipſes happen, when in the time of the N. Moon the mean Motion of the Moon's Latitude is under 12 D. or above 168 D. and below 192 D. or above 348 D. alſo the Lunar Eclipſes do happen when in the time of the Full Moon the mean Motion of the Moon's Latitude is below 17 D. 30′. or above 162 D. 30′. and below 197 D. 30′. or above 342 D. 30′. And although theſe Notes in finding out the Lunar Eclipſes are ſufficiently true, yet the Solar are not ſo certain: For it may happen, tho' ſeldom, (for certain Reaſons) that an Occultation wholly, or (what's more frequent) in a certain Place only, may be hindered; but of this doubtful Momentous Caſe let the Aſtronomer be conſulted. *How to diſtinguiſh the Ecliptick Conjunctions from the Non-Ecliptick in the Juliean Period.*

§. 22. Since thoſe Parts of the *Æquator* which are above and below the Horizon are the vulgar Meaſure of time, and that the ſame Point in the *Æquator* can't aſcend or deſcend at the ſame time every where, it follows, that it can't be the ſame Hour of the Day in all Places at once; but the Sun will ariſe ſooner towards the Eaſtern Parts, and later towards the Weſtern Parts of the World. For Example; if we would compare the Hour of the Day at *Uranburg* and *Jeruſalem* together, at which Place the Sun riſes firſt, there will be more Hours reckoned. Now a good Watch ſhews the *Jews* to be 2 H. 16′. before the *Uranburgers*, in the difference of Meridian; but beſides the *Jews* *Of the Reduction of time from one Meridian to another.*

began their Days different from the *Uranburghers*, viz. at Sun-set, whereas all *Europe* elſe begin their Political Day from Midnight, and the Mathematicians from Noon; which laſt Computation being obſerved here, the *Jews* are 18H. and 2″. adding 16 Min. or is a whole Day, excepting only 3 H. 14′. for generally in all Places by the Satellites of *Jupiter*, the difference of Longitude in Degrees and Minutes are known, which are eaſily converted into Time, by allowing 15 Degrees for an Hour, and ſo on Proportionably.

The End of the Firſt Part.

Breviarium Chronologicum.

BOOK IV.

Treating in Particular

Of the moſt

Celebrated Epocha's:

Of which mention is made either in Sacred or Prophane Hiſtory, digeſted according to their Antiquities.

LONDON,

Printed in the Year 1699.

Breviarium Chronologicum.

BOOK IV.

Treating in Particular of the moſt Celebrated Epocha's.

CHAP. I.

Of the Epocha *of the World.*

DEFINITIONS.

1 *Due Regard is to be had to the Computation of Years, which, according to the Tenure of the Sacred Writ of the Old Teſtament, contains* 1656 *Years to the Deluge.*

2. *Neither ought theſe Intervals of Time to be neglected, which are tranſmitted to Poſterity by the Prophane Hiſtories.*

3. *From whence it will appear that by right comparing the Sacred and Prophane Hiſtories, there muſt be counted* 3949 *Years, according to the* Dionyſian *or vulgar* Æra, *from the firſt beginning of the World to the Birth of Chriſt.*

4. *It ſeems to be very probable, that by God's ſpecial Direction the firſt Year of the World, was alſo the* firſt of the Sabbatic *and* Jubilean Cycles.

5. *The*

5. *The first Day of the World used also to be fixed in one of the Cardinal Points of the Sun; to wit, either the* Æquinox *or* Solstice.

6. *Both the Holy Scripture and the most Ancient Monuments of prophane History seem to intimate that the Beginning of the first Year of the World ought to be constituted in Autumn; which has induced us to fix the first Day of the World in the Autumnal* Æquinox.

7. *And forasmuch as by the Consent of the most exact Chronologers, the first Nights immediately after the Creation of the World were enlightened by one of the principal* Lunar Phases, *their Hypothesis ought also to be taken into consideration.*

8. *Neither ought the Opinion of some other Chronologers to be neglected, who maintain, that since the* Hebdomadic *or* Weekly Cycle *owes its Offspring to the last Day of the* Mosaick Hexameron, *and has thus continued ever since without Interruption to our time, it may be gathered from thence, that the first Day of the said* Hexameron *has likewise been the first* Feria.

9. *This has induced* Scaliger *to affirm, that the World was created in the Year of the* Julian Period 764, *on the 26th Day of* October *on the first* Feria *in the eighth* Solar Cycle, *and the fourth* Lunar Cycle.

To investigate the year since the beginning of the Epocha of the World.

10 *Wherefore there being, according to* Scaliger's *Computation,* 763 *Years and* 9 *Months difference betwixt the beginning of the* Julian Period *and the beginning of the World: If the said Number of Years and Months be added to the Number of Years of the World, the Product will be correspondent to the Year and Month of the* Julian Period. *But if the same be subtracted from the* Julian Period, *there remains the time which is counted from the first beginning of the World.* §. 1.

§. 1. NOT only the *Gentiles*, who according to the Opinion of *Pythagoras*, *Plato*, and ſome of *Ariſtotle's* Followers, acknowledged neither Beginning nor End of the World; but alſo ſome of the Chriſtian Philoſophers, have ridiculed the Chronologers for attempting to determine any certain Seaſon of the Year, for the Creation of the World looking upon it as a frivolous Queſtion, and not worth the Enquiry of the Learned, it being, ſay they, evident that the Times of the Seaſons vary in the World according to the different Climates. But whilſt theſe Gentlemen pretend to ridicule the Chronologers, they make themſelves ridiculous to all the World: For tho' it be undeniable, that purſuant to the Spherical Diſpoſition of the Terreſtrial and Celeſtial Globes, there muſt needs be obſerved at one and the ſame time a great Variety of Seaſons in different Climates, yet does not that in the leaſt affect the Chronologers, who without the leaſt reſpect to the Seaſon, determine their Times by the Ingreſs of the Sun into the Cardinal Points of the *Zodiack*.

Whether it be impoſſible to fix this Epocha upon a certain Foundation.

§. 2. The *Gentiles* were as little ſollicitous about the Year it ſelf, as the time of the year, when the World was created: According to *Cenſorinus*, (a) *Varro* did contribute three ſeveral Intervals of time; the firſt from the beginning of the World to the Deluge ἄδηλον; the ſecond to the Olympiad μυθικὸν, and the third ἱστορικόν. And *Ptolemy* (b) himſelf reprehends thoſe, who pretend to determine the true *Epocha* of the World.

It is not impoſſible to find out the time of the Creation of the World.

But the *Gentiles* are not the people only that exclaim againſt the Preſumption of the *Chronologers*,

(a) De D. N. c. 21. (b) Lib. 3. magn. Conſtruct.

in

in pretending to remedy an Evil which they look upon as incurable. There are also not a few among the Christians who consider this *Æra* no otherwise than the *Gordian* Knots, not to be dissolved by Human Art. Of this Opinion are *Gabriel Rollenhagius*, *Gerard John Vossius*, *Nicolaus Mullerus*, and *Dionysius Petavius* (c): But among all the rest, no body inveighs so much against the Chronologers upon this score as *Isaac Pierius* in his Treatise concerning the *Pre-Adamites*.

I cannot altogether agree in my Opinion with those who would persuade us that *Scaliger's Epocha* of the World is so demonstratively proved as to be past all Contradiction: Nevertheless, I could on the other hand never find any Satisfaction in *Scepticism*. It is therefore my Opinion,

(1.) That all the Characters (alledged as such by *Scaliger*) are not equally Authentick, some of them being certain others uncertain.

(2.) Among the Characters, that of the Interval, which we have said to be betwixt the time of the *Epocha* of the World, and the *Dionysian Æra* of Christ ought to be preferred before the rest.

(3.) That tho' all the Characters of *Scaliger* are not infallible; yet are they more certain than those introduced or made use of by his Adversaries.

(4.) To conclude of the Validity of these Characters, they ought to be all taken together, no Judgment being to be given of all from the Uncertainty of one in particular.

(c) Ratio temp. part. 2. c. 9.

§. 3.

§ 3. There has been as much Dispute among the Chronologers concerning the true Method and Order of the particular Intervals, as about the whole Interval it self, betwixt the *Epocha* of the World and the *Dionysian Æra* of Christ. I agree with these, who range them in the following Order: *Of the particular Intervals betwixt the Epocha of the World and the* Dionysian *Æra of Christ.*

	Years.
From the Creation of the World to the Deluge, are (*d*)	1656.
From thence to the Birth of *Abraham* (*e*),	292
From thence to the Vocation of *Abraham* (*f*),	75
From thence to the departure of the *Jews* out of *Ægypt* (*g*),	430
From thence to the 4th year of the Reign of *Solomon*, or the Building of the Temple (*h*),	480
From thence to the Reign of *Jeroboam* (*i*),	36
From thence to the End of the years of the Sins of the House of *Israel* (*k*),	390
From thence to their Return out of their Captivity, (11 years subtracted from 20, so many being to be counted betwixt the Captivity of *Jechoniah* and *Zedekiah*) (*l*),	39
From *Cyrus* to the second year of *Darius Nothus*, according to the Monuments of prophane History,	110
From thence to the Destruction of the second Temple (*m*),	490
Therefore from the Creation of the World, to the Destruction of the 2d Temple must be counted,	4018

(*d*) Gen. 5. 3. seq. 7. 6. (*e*) Gen. 11. 11. seq. (*f*) Gen. 12. 4. (*g*) Ex. 12. 40. Gal. 3. 17. (*h*) 1 Reg. 6. 1. (*i*) 1 Reg. 11. 42. (*k*) Ezec. 4. 5. (*l*) Jer. 39 13. (*m*) Dan. 9.

And

And whereas the second Destruction of *Jerusalem* hapned in the year of the *Æra* of Christ	69
The whole Interval betwixt the Creation of the World and the vulgar *Æra* of Christ, remains	3949

Reasons for the maintaining of any Hypotheſis.

§. 4. It being evident that this Account is founded upon the Teſtimony of the Holy Writ, till the time of the Deſtruction of the ſecond Temple; and that we have but once call'd to our Aid the ancient and true Monuments of prophane Hiſtory; I ſee no reaſon why the ſame ſhould not carry along with it at leaſt a great Probability. For, granted (what is objected by ſome) that a Difference ought to be allowed betwixt the Years and Days, at the time of the Patriarchs and ours, this does not deſtroy the whole Certainty of theſe Intervals of Years, it being by the Conſent of the Learned, put long ago beyond all Queſtion, that the Years mentioned by *Moſes* in the firſt Book of his Hiſtory, were either *Solar* or *Luna-Solar* Years; or, at leaſt, not much different from the *Solar*, and conſequently from the *Julian* Year; of which we ſhall have occaſion to ſay more hereafter in the *Epocha* of the Deluge.

The Objection of Iſaacus Voſſius *examined*

§. 5. After many Conteſts ariſen concerning the Difference of ſome Years, *Iſaacus Voſſius* has ſome time ago declared open War againſt the whole Body of Chronologers, in his Diſſertation publiſhed in the Year 1658, under the following Title; *A Diſſertation concerning the true Age of the World; where it is demonſtrated that betwixt the time of the Creation of the World and the Birth of* Abraham, *there are at leaſt* 1440 *years wanting.* Not long after this Diſſertation, he publiſhed his *Chronologia Sacra*,

as he calls it, where he begins the 32d Chapter with these following Words: *Sometime ago we have made it appear, that according to the vulgar Calculation there is a Defect of no less than* 1440 *years from the Beginning of the World till the time of* Moses. *Besides which, it is now our Opinion (which appeared doubtful to us before) that* 60 *years more ought to be added to the said Sum,* Thara *the Father of* Abraham *being born so many years later. There is therefore a Defect of Fifteen whole Ages, in the vulgar Calculation, the time from the beginning of the World till the Death of* Moses *being computed by the modern* Jews *to consist of* 2493 *years; whereas the true Interval is* 3993 *years.* It will not be amiss to insert here the Defects in the same Order as they have been set down in Opposition to the Vulgar Chronology, by *Isaacus Vossius.*

His Opinion is that, there are wanting,

	Years.
Betwixt *Adam* and *Seth.*	100
Betwixt *Seth* and *Enoc,*	100
Betwixt *Cainan* and *Malaleel,*	100
Betwixt *Malaleel* and *Jared,*	100
Betwixt *Enoch* and *Methuselah,*	100
Betwixt the Deluge and *Arphaxad,*	10
Betwixt *Arphaxad* and *Cainan,*	100
Betwixt *Cainan,* and *Arphaxad,*	130
Betwixt *Salem* and *Heber,*	100
Betwixt *Heber* and *Phaleg,*	100
Betwixt *Phaleg* and *Ragau;*	100
Betwixt *Ragau* and *Serug,*	100
Betwixt *Serug* and *Nachor,*	100
Betwixt *Nachor* and *Thara,*	100
Betwixt *Thara* and *Abraham,*	60
	1500

But *Voſſius* does not ſtop here; but alledges ſeveral other Intervals, which he ſays, are deficient in the vulgar Chronology: Theſe are the following:

	Years.
Of the *Jews* after *Joſhua*,	18
The time of the Servitude of *Iſrael* under *Cuſhan*,	8
The Anarchy after the Death of *Othoniel*,	...
Their Servitude under the *Moabites*,	18
The Anarchy after the Death of *Ahud*,	...
Their Servitude under *Jabin*,	20
The Anarchy after *Deborah*,	...
Their Servitude under the *Midianites*,	7
The Anarchy after *Jair*,	...
The Servitude under the *Ammonites*,	18
The Anarchy after the Death of *Abdon*,	...
Their Servitude under the *Philiſtines*,	40
The Anarchy after the Death of *Heli*, the High-Prieſt,	20

Theſe and ſeveral other Defects are imputed to vulgar Chronology by *Iſaacus Voſſius*; to prove which, he calls to his Aid not only the Authority of the 70 Interpreters, and *Joſephus*, but alſo the Ancient Monuments of the *Ægyptians*, *Chaldeans*, and *Chineſes*; which, he ſays, are of a much older Date than the vulgar *Epocha's* of the World: and that the only way to remove all Difficulties in this kind for the future, is to add a certain Number of Years to the vulgar *Epocha*: *Who can be either ſo blind as not to ſee*, ſays he (n), *or who dare deny, that the moſt proper and the only way to convince thoſe who make uſe of the Authority of Prophane Hiſtory in contradiction of the Sacred Writ, is to demonſtrate the Truth of the Sacred Hiſtory out of the Annals of the* Gentiles? *Bryon*

(n) P. 280. *Wa*

Walton ſeems to be of the ſame Opinion with *Voſſius*; for in the *Prolegomena* to his Bible printed in *London*, he declares that the Computation, according to the *Hebrew* Text, is not to be relied on; but that in its ſtead the 70 Interpreters ought to be conſulted. But as we ſhall have Occaſion to examine the Authority of the *Greek* Computation in that Chapter of the *Epocha of the Deluge*, ſo as to what has been objected to Chronologers concerning the newly invocated prophane Antiquities, I cannot but give this ſeaſonable Cautiion; that it appears to me the moſt unbecoming a Chriſtian Philoſopher to prefer the fabulous Relations of the *Gentiles* before the Authority of the Sacred Hiſtory. Beſides that, *Voſſius* ought to have conſidered, that his 15 Ages will fall much ſhort from ſupplying the Difference there is betwixt the vulgar *Epocha* of the World and thoſe of the *Chineſes* and other *Gentiles*. Neither can he be ignorant that among the *Gentiles* themſelves *Plutarch* and *Cenſorinus*, and among the Chriſtians, St. *Auſtin*, have many years ago left it as their Opinion to the World, that the years mentioned in the Chronologies of the *Gentiles* are not of the ſame length with ours.

§. 6. But ſince we have ſaid enough about the *Epocha* of the World, according to the Computation of the Intervals; the next thing in order which is offered to our Conſideration is, to inſert ſomething alſo concerning the Four Quarters of the Year. *Tacitus* relates that the ancient *Germans* knew no more than of Three Seaſons of the Year: But the Diviſion of the Year into Four Cardinal Quarters has been received many Ages among moſt Nations. The Beginning of the Spring is fixed at the time of the Ingreſs of the Sun into ♈, of the Summer in ♋, of the Autumn in ♎, of the Winter in ♑. The Subject of our preſent Enquiry is, in which of theſe Four

What time of the year the World was created.

Cardinal Points the first Day of the World is to be fixed.

There is scarce any body that I know of who has taken upon him to plead for the Winter in this case, unless it be (o) *Cluverius*, who in his *German* Antiquities seems to misapply the Word *Hyems* or *Winter*, when he says thus; *Quæritur nunc, quâ tempestate initium anni fecerint Celtæ, veris, æstatis, an hyemis principio? Omnino, hyemis credo principio, ut Ægyptii, Hebræorumque vetustissimi: Nam id ipsum conditi Ævi fuit initium.*

There are also a few Modern Authors who fix the time of the Creation of the World in the Summer. But both *Solinus* and *Macrobius* relate, that this was the Opinion of the ancient *Ægyptians*. For the (p) first expressly says, that the *Ægyptian* Priests had fixed the first Day of the World on the 18th of *July*: And (q) *Macrobius* alledges concerning the *Ægyptians*, That as they were the first that applied themselves to Astronomy, so they had attributed the Lion as the proper House to the Sun; *because*, says he, *this was considered among them as the Native Sign of the Sun.*

Gerhardus Mercator who (according to the Testimony of *Buntingus*) was the most exact Chronologer of his time, follows the Opinion of the *Ægyptians*, in this Point; because it is related in the History of the Deluge, that the Dove returned with a green Olive-Leaf on the 17th Day of the 11th Month. Now if it be allowed that the Olive-Tree does not blossom but in *May*, the Consequence is plain enough. And if the 11th Month counted from the beginning of the World, be correspondent to the Month of *May*, the Month of *July* must of Necessity have been the first.

(o) Lib. 1. c. 33. (p) Polyhist. c. 35. (q) In Somn. Scip. l. 1. c. 21.

But

But there are many Eminent Writers, who with equal Paſſion plead either for the Spring or Autumn. Among thoſe who ſet up for Patrons for the Spring, (r) *Virgil* declares himſelf thus:

Non alios prima creſcentis origine Mundi
Illuxiſſe dies, aliumve habuiſſe tenorem
Crediderim; Ver illud erat, Ver magnus agebat
Orbis, & hybernis parcebant Flatibus Eurî.

Of the ſame Opinion are *Euſebius*, *S. Ambroſe*, *S. Cyril*, *S. Auſtin*, *Beda*, *Melancton*, *Bucholzerus*, *Buntingus*, *Cedomannus*, *Keplerus*, *Kyatzhemius*, *Mercerius*, *Aſtadius*, *Spondanus*, *Capellus*, *Edward Simpſon* and *William Lange*; as alſo *Scaliger*, at firſt, beſides the *Armenians*, *Perſians*, and moſt other Eaſtern Countries, who all begin their Computation with the Spring.

But thoſe that have declared for the Autumnal Quarter, are not Inferiour in Authority to the others. Thoſe who at preſent occur to my Memory, are, (s) S. *Jerome*, *Nicolaus Lyra*, almoſt all the *Jewiſh* Writers, but eſpecially *Joſephus* (t), *Menaſſeh ben Iſrael* (u), who cites a great Number of his own Country-men, *Alphonſus Teſtatus*, *Torniellus*, *Scaliger*, *Petavius*, *Helvicus*, *Bhemius*, *Maſtlinus*, *Ubbo Emmius*, *Calviſius*, *Philippus*, *Cluverius*, *Jacobus Uſſerius*, *Joannes Temporarius*, *Hainlinus*, *Helwigius*, all the *Ruſſians* and other modern Nations; to which Opinion we alſo ſubſcribe.

§. 7. And we will alledge here in ſhort the Arguments which commonly are, or may be made uſe of for the Confirmation of this Opinion; among which are ſome of the *Rabbi's*, which contain more Vanity than Certainty,

Reaſons alledged for the Aſſertion.

(r) L. 3. Georg. (s) Exod. c. 12. (t) L. 1. ant. c. 4. (u) Con. p. 18.

(1.) Because the Patriarchs in most ancient times always began the Year in Autumn, and that therefore the *Jews* would not without an expres's Command begin their Eccleſiaſtical Year in the Month of *Niſan*.

(2.) Because the Time of gathering the Fruits of the Earth (which without doubt was in Autumn in *Paleſtine*) is called the Revolution of the Year in the Holy Scripture.

(3.) Because it is ſaid (*x*) that the Deluge began in the ſecond Month, to wit, in reſpect of the Years from the beginning of the World. And the ſame is mentioned by (*y*) *Joſephus*, to have been *Marcheſvan*, or the ſecond in Autumn.

(4.) Because the *Sabbatic* and *Jubilean* Years began in Autumn, which being inſtituted for to let the Grounds reſt during that time, this Ordination of God would appear not ſo ſuitable if the Creation of the World had begun in the Spring.

(5.) Because the Day of *Expiation* to be celebrated on the 10th Day of the Month *Tiſri* ſeems to be inſtituted in Remembrance of the Fall of *Adam*: But if *Adam*'s Fall did happen in Autumn, conſequently the Creation of the World began about the ſame time.

(6.) Because according to the moſt ancient Inſtitution of the *Jews*, the Story of the Creation of the World was to be read in the ſame Month *Tiſri*.

(7.) Because the (*z*) *Chaldean Interpreter* aſſerts that the firſt Autumnal Month has alſo been the firſt of the World.

(8.) Because there ſeems to be the ſame Relation betwixt Darkneſs and Light as there is betwixt Autumn and the other Seaſons of the Year:

(*x*) Exod. 23. c. 16. 34. c. 22. (*y*) L. 1. c. 4. (*z*) In 3 Reg. 8. vca. 2.

But

But Darkneſs was before Light, and by conſequence Autumn before the reſt.

(9.) Becauſe it is ſaid of the Trees, That they contained their Seed within them, which ſeems not to be ſo congruouſly applied to the Spring as to the Autumn.

(10.) Becauſe *Rabbi Eliezer* and ſome other *Jews* by tranſpoſing the firſt Word of *Geneſis*, interpret it thus according to their *Cabbala*.

Whether the World was created about the time of the New Moon.

§. 8. *Dionyſius Petavius* affirms, that God commenced the great Work of Creation in the year of the Julian Period 730, on the 20th day of *October* on the firſt *Feria*; and that the Moon was at the full on the 27th of *October*, on the ſecond *Feria* ſome Hours after Midnight, and that conſequently on the fourth day, being the 29th of *October*, when the Moon was created it appeared ſomewhat in its Decreaſe. But it appears more probable to me, that the World, or at leaſt the great Luminaries were created about the New Moon: ſo that our firſt Parents ſaw the Moon Cornicular before the firſt Quarter, and thus encreaſing till the Full Moon; whereas if it be ſuppoſed that the Creation of the World was begun in the Full Moon, they muſt have ſeen the Moon firſt in its Decreaſe, and afterwards in its Increaſe, and conſequently in its retrograde Courſe.

Of the difference among the Chronologers concerning the Luna-Solar Characters.

§. 9. The Arguments ariſing among the Chronologers concerning the *Lunæ-Solar Characters* at the time of the Creation of the World may conveniently be divided into ſeveral *Claſſes*: For there are ſome who altogether reject the Conſideration of theſe Characters, among whom one of the chiefeſt is the Author of the *Myſtical* Chronology. There are ſecondly, not a few who fix theſe Characters depending on the Motion of the Sun and Moon,

(a) De doctr. Temp. l. 9. c. 6.

on the first Day of the *Mosaick Hexaemeron*, being of Opinion that on the same day when the Work of Creation was begun, both these great Luminaries did enter into one certain Cardinal Point of the Sphere; of which Opinion is also *Dionysius* (*b*) *Petavius*. The Third *Classis* consists of such as appoint the Fourth Day of the Creation to the *Æquinox* and principal *Lunar Phasis*, this being the Time when God created the great Luminaries. *Some*, says *Jacobus Capellus*, *begin this Time of the N. Moon and the* Æquinox *on the first* Feria, *when the Light was created. But it appears to me more probable that they ought to begin on the 4th* Feria, *when the Sun was created. Michael Mæstlinus* and *Laurentius Codomannus* are constant Adherers to the same Opinion. In the fourth place, there are also some who appropriate these Characters to the first Day of the second Week; of which Opinion are (*c*) *Ubbo Emmius* and (*d*) *Scaliger*. Neither ought in the 5*th* Place the Opinion of Mr. *William Lange* (*e*) to be pass'd by in Silence; who says thus; *The Creation of the World was in the Spring, on the first Day of the first Week of the first Month of the first Year.* To extricate our selves in some measure out of these Difficulties, I see no better Remedy than to have Recourse to the most exact Account that can be made, according to the *Lunæ-Solar* Tables, with this Caution, not to insist so much upon these fictitious Motions, which, as *Hainlinus* well observed, are only invented by the Astronomers for better Method's sake, than upon the true and real ones. Accordingly we have, pursuant to the Hypotheses of the *Danish* Astronomy (which are the *Basis* of our Mathematicall Tables) investigated the *Lunæ-Solar* Motions to begin with Sun-set according to the Custom of the *Jews* in *Palestine*.

(*b*) De Doctr. Temp. l. 9. c. 6. (*c*) In Can. Chron. (*d*) L. 5. emend. Temp. (*e*) L. 2. de Enn. Christ.

Tem-

	Oct.	f.	H.	′	″.
Tempus Syz. med. an. 764	27	2	7	36	20
Intervallum addendum,			7	32	6
Tempus Syz. veræ,	27	2	15	8	26
	Sign.	*Gr.*			
Longit. ☉ *med.*		6	2	40	30
Anomalia ☉ *med.*		6	2	19	57
Proſtaph. ☉ *Add.*				15	11
Longit. ☽ *à* ☉ *med.*		0	3	49	37
Anomal. Lunæ,		1	19	57	32
Proſtaphær. Lunæ Subtr.			3	44	28
Anomal. Æquinoct.		8	2	29	30
Proſtaph. Æquin. Add.				24	19
Verus Locus Solis,		6	3	10	6
Verus Locus Lunæ,		6	3	10	6

From whence it appears, that on the ſame day of *October* in the year 764, of the *Julian* Period, on which (*f*)*Scaliger*, not without Reaſon, believes the World to have been created, the Autumnal *Æquinox* and N. Moon did not happen together; notwithſtanding this has been contradicted by many, who have been deceived by theſe Aſtronomical Tables, that were not exactly congruous to the true Motions of theſe Luminaries. Neither am I the only Perſon who has obſerved this Diſcrepancy betwixt the *Equinoxes*, and the time of the N. Moon. *Nicolaus Mullerus* has likewiſe acknowledged a Difference betwixt them, of 15 Days: Wherefore out of theſe ſeveral alledged Opinions and Calculations of the Aſtronomers, it is manifeſt that we ought not to inſiſt too rigorouſly upon the Characters of the *Æquinox* and N. Moon, but that it is ſufficient to know that the Creation of the World hapned about the time of the *Æquinox* and N. Moon.

(*f*) Iſag. in Cal. Cap. 7.

§. 10.

Of the Opinion of Longomontanus.

§. 10. (*g*) *Chriſtianus Longomontanus*, who has publiſhed the *Daniſh* Aſtronomy, has likewiſe pretended to a new Character, founded upon the Motion of the *Apogæum* of the Sun; but beſides that, the Point of the *Apogæum* is a meer Aſtronomical Fiction, invented for the better explaining of the ſeveral Celeſtial Motions: It is confeſs'd by the Conſent of the beſt Aſtronomers, that the Motions depending on it are not ſufficiently known to make them a Foundation of any ſolid Opinion. (*h*) *John Baptiſt Ricciolus* has exhibited us a Catalogue of 17 of the ableſt Aſtronomers who affirm this for an undeniable Truth.

Concerning the various Opinions about the Computation of this Epocha.

§. 11. There is a great Diſcrepancy betwixt the *Greeks*, *Hebrews*, and modern *Latin* Authors about the true Computation of the Years of the World. St. (*i*) *Hierom* did in his days already complain that even among thoſe that had founded their Calculations from the *Hebrew* Text, there were very few who did agree entirely in their Opinions. This Variety of Sentiments has encreaſed ſince to that degree, that to pretend to examine and correct the almoſt innumerable Differences of all theſe Authors, would be to undertake an endleſs piece of Work. *Joannes Wolfius*, *Sixtus Sinenſis*, *Krantzhemius*, *Elias Reuſnerus*, *Leo Allatius*, *Fabritius Paduanus*, and many others have endeavoured to make a Collection of the ſeveral Opinions concerning the Epocha of the World; but upon a ſtrict Examination we have obſerved that theſe great Men, whilſt they endeavoured to diſcover the Errors of others, are unhappily fallen under ſeveral Miſtakes themſelves, by confounding the vulgar Epocha of Chriſt, with thoſe ſuppoſed as ſuch by thoſe Authors they intended to correct.

(*g*) Lib. 1. Theor. c. 2. (*h*) Lib. 3. de Sole, c. 25. (*i*) Ad Tit. Cap. 3.

To

To give you a ſmall Epitome of the various Opinions of the beſt Aſtronomers on this Subject, I have inſerted here about half a hundred of them, diſpoſed in ſuch an Order as that in the firſt Column you may find the Year of the *Julian* Period, which has been aſſigned for the Epocha of the World, according to the Hypotheſis of each Author, whoſe Name ſtands equal with the Number, tho' he perhaps himſelf not as much as dreamt of the *Julian* Period. The ſecond Column ſhews the Interval betwixt the beginning of the World and the vulgar Epocha of Chriſt, according to the Opinion of each Author, whoſe Name is mentioned in the ſame Line with the Number. Betwixt both the Columns we thought fit to inſert the Number of the Cycle of the Sun that we might not be cenſured of pretending to give you Inſtructions without a right Character; and that we might preſent the Reader with a Key to as many Chronological Treatiſes as there are Authors Names contained in the next following Table:

The

The World was created according to the Opinion of	Y. of the Jul. Per.	⊙s. Cyc.	Int. till the Ep. of Chr.
Alphonsus K. of Castile.	5709 m. 3	25	6484 m. 9
The Author of the Sicilian Collections,	7085 m. 3	1	5608 m. 9
If. Vof. and the Greeks,	7096	12	5598
Theophilus,	7179	11	5515
The Constantinopolitans and Alexandrians,	7185 m. 9	17	5508 m. 3
The Æthiopians,	7194 m. 3	26	5499 m. 9
Cedrenus,	7200 m. 3	4	5493 m. 9
Pandorus,	7201	5	5493
Maximus the Monk,	7292 m. 3	6	5491 m. 9
Sulpitius Severus,	7225	1	5469
Victor Giselius in his Observations upon Sulpit.	7275	23	5419
Isod. Hispalensis,	7484	8	5410
Eusebius,	7493 m. 3	17	5200 m. 9
Beda,	7495	19	5199
Orosius and the Author of the Roman Martyrology,	7496	20	5198
Marianus Scotus,	521 m. 3	17	4192 m. 9
Laurentius Codomann.	572 m. 3	12	4141 m. 9
Tho. Lyd. an E. Auth.	610 m. 3	22	4103 m. 9
Michael Mœstlinus,	634 m. 3	18	4079 m. 3
J. Bapt. Ricciolus,	651 m. 3	7	4062 m. 3
Jacob Salian,	660 m. 3	16	4053 m. 9
Henricus Spondanus,	662 m. 3	18	4051 m. 9
William Lange,	672 m. 3	28	4041 m. 9
Erasmus Reinholt,	692 m. 9	20	4021 m. 3
Jacob Cappell,	708 m. 3	8	4005 m. 9
John Wichman,	709 m. 3	9	4004 m. 9
Edward Simson,	710 m. 3	10	4003 m. 9
Jacob. Usser. Armach	710 m. 9	10	4003 m. 9
Laurent. Eichstadt.	710		4004
Dion. Petavius,	730 m. 9	0	3983 m. 3
Krantzheim,	740 m. 3	14	3971 m. 9

Abrae

The World was created according to the Opinion of	*Y. of the Jul. Pe.*	☉*s. Cyc.*	*Int. till the Ep. of Chr.*
Abraham Bucholtzer,	743 *m.* 3	15	3970 *m.* 9
Elias Reusnerus,	744	16	3970
Christianus Matthias & Joannes Cluverius.	745 *m.* 3	17	3968 *m.* 9
Henricus Buntingus,	746 *m.* 3	18	3967 *m.* 9
Christianus Longomontanus,	747 *m.* 9	19	3966 *m.* 3
The same Author in his Hypothesis in Astronomiam Danicam,	750	22	3964
Philip Melancton, Peucerus *and* Funccius,	750	22	3964
Jacob Haynlin,	750 *m.* 9	22	3963 *m.* 3
Alphonsus Salmeron,	756	28	3958
Joannes Georg. Herw. ab Hoenburg,	759	3	3955
Scaliger, Calvisius, Ubbo Emmius, Behmius *and* Helvicus,	764 *m.* 9	8	3949 *m.* 3
Christianus Schotanus,	765 *m.* 9	9	3948 *m.* 3
Joannes Micrœlius,	766	10	3948
Hermann. Contractus,	768 *m.* 3	12	3945 *m.* 9
Matthæus Beroaldus,	786 *m.* 9	2	3927 *m.* 3
Andreas Helwigius,	877 *m* 9	9	3836 *m.* 3
The Jewish *vulgar Computation*,	953 *m.* 9	1	3760 *m.* 3
David Gantz,	954	2	3760
The lesser Chronicle of the Jews,	1044	8	3670

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Of the Epocha of the Jews.

1. *This Epocha has the ſame beginning with the Creation of the World.*
2. *It begins in Autumn in the Month* Tiſri.
3. *The years of this Epocha are* Lunæ-Solar *years, containing ſometimes twelve, ſometimes thirteen Months.*
4. *May conſequently be compared to the* Julian *years.*
5. *The firſt year of this Epocha was likewiſe the firſt in the* Sabbatic Cycle.
6. *From the Beginning of this Epocha to the vulgar* Dionyſian Æra, *are* 3760 *Years, and about four Months.*
7. *The beginning of this Epocha falls out in the year of the* Julian *Period* 953, *in the firſt Month of Autumn, in the firſt Cycle of the Sun, and the third of the Moon, according to the* Latin *Calculation.*

To find the Year ſince the beginning of this Epocha.

8. *Wherefore if you add to the* Jewiſh Epocha 952 *Years and* 8 *Months, the Sum will be equivalent to the Year of the* Julian Period; *and if you ſubtract the ſaid* 952 *Years and* 8 *Months from the Year and Month of the* Julian Period; *the Reſidue ſhews the Year of the* Jewiſh Epocha.

The Origin of this Epocha.

§. 1. THIS Epocha is called the *Jewiſh Epocha*, becauſe the *Jews* commonly make uſe of it in their Records and Writings; ſometimes expreſſing the whole Number of Years; ſometimes by leaving out the Thouſands; of which more hereafter.

§. 2.

§. 2. The *Jews* do as little agree in this *Epocha*, as the *Chriſtians* in theirs, concerning the Creation of the World, as is manifeſtly apparent out of their Chronologies. But as we *Chriſtians* make uſe of our vulgar *Æra* of Chriſt, notwithſtanding the ſame is looked upon as erroneous by the Learned, ſo the *Jews* uſe this *Epocha* of the Beginning of the World in all their Records. *Different Opinions among the Jews concerning this Epocha.*

§. 3. The *Jews* expreſs this Epocha ſometimes by Letters, ſometimes by Numbers, and very frequently abbreviated, by leaving out the millennary Number. As for Inſtance: The Learned *Jew*, *Menaſſeh Ben Iſrael*, when he publiſhed the *Hebrew* Bible in our time at *Amſterdam*, affixed to it, the Year 395. Whereas, if he had expreſs'd the whole Number of Years, he muſt have writ, in the year 5395. *How the Jews write the years of this Epocha.*

§. 4. Both the Time and Author of this Epocha is unknown as well among the *Jews* as *Chriſtians*. *Scaliger* refers the Origin of this Epocha to the time of the *Seleucides*. *Chriſtomannus* is of Opinion that the *Jews* did not introduce this Epocha till after their *Babylonian Thalmud*. There are alſo others who believe this Epocha to have been received among them in latter Ages; as may be ſeen in (*a*) *Samuel Petit*, and (*b*) *Petavius*. It is our Opinion that the *Jews* cannot ſhew any ſufficient Authority for the Antiquity of this Epocha. *Of the Author of this Epocha.*

§. 5. We told in the preceding Chapter that the World was created in the year 764 of the *Julian* Period. And whereas the *Jews*, according to their Hypotheſis, refer it to the year 953 of the *Julian Period*, it is manifeſt that betwixt the true *Epocha* of *Scaliger* and the *Jewiſh* there is a difference of 189 years. *Joſephus Scaliger*, *Concerning the difference betwixt the Chriſtians and Jews in this Epocha.*

(*a*) Eclog. l. 1. c. 1. (*b*) de Doct. Temp. l. 7. c. 17.

Hen-

Henricus Wolffius, *Robertus Pontanus*, and several others, are of Opinion that this was only an artificial Epocha among the *Jews*, not intended to determine the true time of the Creation of the World. But I cannot find any Reason sufficient to induce me to agree with them; because it has always been entituled as such; and the *Jews* were so careful in maintaining, or at least palliating this Computation of their Epocha of the World, that they have industriously contracted several Intervals into a less Number of Years, especially in what relates to the second Monarchy and the Interval betwixt the Destruction of the first, and the rebuilding of the last Temple, contrary to the ancient and undoubted Monuments of both the Sacred and Prophane History; as is most evident out of the *lesser Chronicle* of the *Jews* in the Intervals set down from the Creation of the World to the Destruction of the second Temple.

	Years.
From *Adam* to the Deluge,	1656
From the Deluge till the Division of Tongues,	340
From thence till the Nativity of *Isaac*,	52
From thence to the time of their going out of *Ægypt*,	400
From thence till their Arrival in the Land of *Canaan*,	40
From thence to the *Babylonian* Captivity,	850
From thence to the rebuilding of the Temple,	70
From thence to the Destruction of the second Temple,	420
The total Sum from the Creation till the Destruction of the 2d Temple being	3828

From

From whence it is apparent, that they would not have their Epocha paſs for an Invention; but the true *Æra* of the Creation of the World. But there are not a few, among whom is (c) *Iſaacus Voſſius*, who imputes to the *Jews* that they did thus mutilate their Computations not till after the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, out of a Hatred to the Chriſtian Name; when beſides many other leſſer Intervals, they cut off 440 years from the true Computation extant in their moſt ancient Manuſcripts, that thus by introducing a Defect of two thouſand Years, they might render the Coming of Chriſt dubious to Poſterity.

§. 6. And the *Jews* did not ſettle their Annual Computations upon imaginary or fictitious Notions; but for many Ages paſt were guided by the Motions of the great Luminaries. Thus *Maimonides* ſays, the Months of the Year are the *Months of the Moon. Our Years are computed by the Years of the Sun.* *Of the* Jewiſh *Years.*

§. 7. Yet *Scaliger* has been very anxious in finding out which of the Aſtronomical Hypotheſes the *Jews* have followed in their *Lunæ-Solar* Year: But in my Opinion he might have ſaved himſelf much Labour and Time, if he would but have conſidered that the *Jews* had followed the Footſteps of *Ptolemy*, as is ſufficiently demonſtrated by *Nicholaus Mullerus* in his Preface to a Treatiſe concerning the *Lunæ-Solar Years of the* Jews. *According to which Hypotheſis the* Jews *regulate their Years.*

§. 8. The Names Order, and Number of Days of the *Jewiſh* Months according to their Political Year (for the Eccleſiaſtical Year begins with the Month *Niſan*) are expreſſed in the following Table. *The Names and Order of the* Jewiſh *Months.*

(c) Chron p. 237.

	Days.
I. The Autumnal Quarter consisting of	
1. The Month *Tisri*, containing	30
2. The Month *Marcheſvan*, containing	29
3. The Month *Caſleu*, containing	30
II. The Winter Quarter consisting of	
4. The Month *Tabeth*, containing	29
5. The Month *Schebhat*, containing	30
6. The Month *Adar*, containing	29
III. The Spring Quarter consisting of	
7. The Month *Niſan*, containing	30
8. The Month *Jiar*, containing	29
9. The Month *Sivan*, containing	30
IV. The Summer Quarter consisting of	
10. The Month *Tamuz*, containing	29
11. The Month *Ab*, consisting	30
12. The Month *Elul*,	29

Several sorts of the Jewish *Years.*

§ 9. And because the *Jews* made use of *Solar* years, but *Lunar* Months, they must of necessity, besides the 12 ordinary Months, interpose at certain times an extraordinary one: From whence it comes that they divided their Years in the common Years of 12 Months, and the *Emboliſmean* Years. And whereas their Months consisted by turns of 30, and again of 29 Days; the first are called the compleat, the last the defective Months: And to prevent any Confusion which might arise from this alternative Change in the Translation of the *Feria's*, they were obliged either to augment or diminish the Number of Days of certain Months; so that the Years of the *Jews* were divided into six several sorts: For

The Common Year was divided into

	Days.
1. The abounding Year, containing	355
2. The common Year, containing	354
3. The defective Year, containing	353

The

The *Emboliſmæan* Year was likewiſe divided into

	Days.
4. The abounding Year, containing	385
5. The common Year, containing	384
6. The defective Year, containing	383

Theſe Varieties of Years proceeding from the Interpolation of Days affected only the three Months *Adar*, *Marcheſvan*, and *Caſleu*: For in the *Emboliſmæan* Year there were two Months of *Adar*, and in the abounding Year the Month *Marcheſvan* was always compleat, as in the defective Year the Month *Caſleu* was always defective: So that in the firſt there were always three ſucceſſive compleat Months, in the laſt always three ſucceſſively defective.

CHAP. III.

Of the Epocha of the Deluge.

1. *This Epocha ought in all reſpects to be congruous to the* Hebrew *Text written by* Moſes.
2. *According to the 5th and 7th Chapters of* Geneſis *the Diſtance betwixt this Epocha and that of the World, ought to be* 1656 *years.*
3. *It muſt agree in all reſpects with the other Intervals of Time, till the Beginning of the Vulgar Chriſtian Epocha, which contains* 2293 *years.*
4. *Care is to be taken that none of the Patriarchs be involved in the Waters of the Deluge.*
5. *Thus it will fall in the Year of the* Julian *Period* 2420, *in Autumn, in the Cycle* ☉. 12. ☽. 7.

How to investigate the years since the Deluge.

6. *And since therefore there are* 2419 *years and near* 10 *months difference betwixt the Beginning of the* Julian Period *and the Epocha of the* Deluge, *if the said Sum be added to the Number of years since the Deluge, the Product will be exactly correspondent to the Year of the* Julian Period. *But if the abovesaid Number of Years and Months be subtracted from the whole Product, the Residue shews the Year and Month of the Epocha of the* Deluge.

Whether the years of the Patriarchs were monthly years.

§. 1. *Pliny* in his Natural History, (*a*) *Diodorus Siculus*, as likewise (*b*) *Macrobius*, with many others, relate that among the *Ægyptians* their Years were in most ancient times sometimes of one Month, sometimes of two, three or four Months; which has perhaps moved *Varro* (according to (*c*) *Lactantius* his Testimony) to interpret the Computation, of *Moses* not of *Solar* but *Lunar* Years. But this may be sufficiently confuted by that Mention is made in (*d*) *Genesis* of the first, second and seventh Months, which destroys this Notion. (*e*) Besides that according to this Supposition the Patriarchs must have procreated Children at the Age of five, six, and seven Years, as is most evident in (*f*) *Thara* the Father of *Abraham*, who is said to have begot *Abraham* in the 70th Year of his Age.

Thara

Whether they were Solar or Lunar-Solar years.

§. 2. And as most Chronologers agree in this Point, that the Years used by the Patriarchs have not been much different from those in the *Julian* Calendar; so they are divided in their Opinions whether in those Ancient Times they made their Computations by *Lunæ-Solar* or *Solar* Years. The *Jews* are of Opinion that the Year of the Deluge was the same with their ordinary Year, consisting of 12 Months, according to the Motion of the Moon. Some of their *Rabbi's* have been

(*a*) Bibl. l. 1. (*b*) Saturn. l. 1. (*c*) L. 2. c. 13. (*d*) Gen. 8. 13. (*e*) 14. 8. Gen. 7. v. 11. c. 8. 5. (*f*) Gen. 11. 26.

vain

vain enough to pretend to perſuade the World that during the time of the Deluge, the two great Luminaries did not appear above that Hemiſphere; and that *Noah* did diſtinguiſh the Times of the Days, Nights, Months and Years, partly by the Natural Inſtinct that was in ſome Beaſts within the Ark, of diſtinguiſhing the Times as in the Aſs, Cock, Turkey, *&c.* partly by a certain Gem of the ſame Nature with that by which they ſay, *Moſes* knew the exact difference of Times, when he converſed with God for 40 Days. There are not a few among the Chriſtians, but eſpecially *Henricus Buntingus* and *William Lange*, who agree with the *Jews* in this Suppoſition concerning the *Lunæ-Solar* Years.

But *Scaliger* is quite of another Sentiment, being perſwaded that before the *Babylonian* Captivity there were not the leaſt Footſteps of theſe *Lunæ-Solar* Years to be met with in the Holy Scripture; becauſe it is ſaid of *David* and *Solomon*, *That they had twelve Officers which provided Proviſions for the King and his Houſhold; each Man made Proviſion for his Month in the Year*: And that therefore if the *Lunæ-Solar* Year had been in uſe among the *Jews* of that time, there muſt have been thirteen Officers by reaſon of the *Emboliſmean* Year, conſiſting of thirteen *Lunar* Months. It is for this Reaſon that *Scaliger* as well as *Johannes Behmius*, *Ubbo Emmius*, *Sethus Calviſius* and others, plead for the Solar Year at the time of the Deluge, each Month, like the *Ægyptians*, conſiſting of 30 days, with an Addition of five Days at certain Intervals. I muſt confeſs 'tis of no great Conſequence as to the Hiſtorical Truth, whether we admit the *Lunæ-Solar* or *Solar* Years; yet it cannot be denied but that there are ſtrong Probabilities to be met with in the Hiſtory of the Deluge, which appear in behalf of the Solar Years. It is ſaid in (*g*) *Geneſis*, *That on the 17th day of the ſecond Month all the Fountains of the*

(*g*) Cap. 7. v. 11.

Earth and the Windows of Heaven were opened; and (b) that the Waters began to abate after the end of an hundred and fifty Days; (i) and that the Ark rested on the seventeenth Day of the seventh Month. From whence it is evident that these could be no *Lunar* Months, each of which consisting only of 29 Days and 12 Minutes, could not make up the Number of 150 Days. It is therefore most probable, that they regulated themselves at that time according to the same Calendar, which afterwards was called the *Ægyptian*, each Month of which contained exactly 30 Days; and at the end of every Year an Addition was made of five Days, besides that at the end of every Age, consisting of 120 Years, (of which also mention is made in (k) *Genesis*) there used to be a further Addition of six other Days: In which point also (l) *Dionysius Petavius* seems to agree with *Scaliger*, though in most other Matters he is contradictory to his Opinion.

Difference betwixt the Hebrew and Greek Computations.

§. 3. The following Table represents the vast Disproportion betwixt the *Greeks* on the one, and the *Hebrews* and *Latines* on the other side, concerning the Number of Years of the Antediluvian Patriarchs.

4.

(b) Cap. 8. v. 3. (i) Cap. ib. v. 4. (k) Cap. 6. v. 3. (l) Lib. 9. C. 9. de Doct. temp.

Ad-

According to the Hebrews,	Years.	LXX *Int.*	
From the Creation to *Seth* are	130	230	*Gen.* 5. *v.* 3
From thence to *Enoch*,	105	205	6
From thence to *Cainan*,	90	190	9
to *Mahaleel*,	70	170	12
to *Jared*,	165	165	15
to *Enoch*,	162	162	18
to *Methuselah*,	165	165	21
to *Lamech*,	187	187	25
to *Noah*,	182	188	28
to the Deluge,	600	600	*Gen.* 7. 6
Sum of the Years before the Deluge,	1656	2262	

§. 4. Both the ancient and modern Authors are extremely divided in their Opinions concerning this vast Disproportion betwixt the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Text. (*m*) St. *Austin*, is of opinion, that ſome being pre-poſſeſſed with an Opinion that the Years of the Patriarchs were to be underſtood of Lunar or Monthly Years, had inſerted theſe Alterations in the Verſion of the LXX Interpreters. *Morin* with ſome others, on the other hand maintain that the *Hebrew* Text is corrupted. But among all the modern Authors, *Iſaacus Voſſius* and *Bryon Walton* plead ſtrongly for the Authority of the *Greek* Verſion; and accuſe all the Chronologers of a moſt manifeſt Error for having left out above fifteen Ages in their Computation of the Age of the World. *If* Moſes *ſhould riſe again*, (ſays (*n*) *Voſſius*) *in our Days he would not be able to underſtand one Word of the* Jewiſh *Books, they having got their Letters from the* Chaldæans, *their Points and Accents from the* Maſſoreths. *Voſſius* goes yet further, alledging that not only the Letters but the Senſe it ſelf is corrupted, not only

Various Opinions concerning this differences.

(*m*) Lib. 19. c. 43. de Civ. Dei. (*n*) P. 248.

by the Careleſſneſs of the Tranſcribers, but eſpecially by the inveterate Malice of the *Jews*. His Words containing the whole Subſtance of his New Hypotheſis are theſe: *He*, ſays he, *that has a deſire to attain to the Underſtanding of the true ſenſe of the Holy Writ, ought not to make the leaſt Reflection upon the Vowels which are inſerted by the* Maſſoreths: *But if any uſe is to be made of them at all, it muſt be done by correcting them according to the Tranſlation of the LXX Interpreters. This is the true Text, whoſe Authority is founded upon the Approbation of the moſt ancient* Jews, *the Evangeliſts, the Apoſtles, and the whole Primitive Church.* To give my real Sentiment in this weighty Affair, conſidering the great Reputation eſtabliſhed by the Approbation of Antiquity, of the undoubted Skill of the LXX Interpreters in the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Languages, and their unqueſtionable Fidelity and Sincerity, they ought not to be bereaved of their due Praiſe, if we were well aſſured that this Verſion was tranſmitted to Poſterity without any Alteration. But thoſe, who accuſe the Chronologers with ſo much Boldneſs would have done well to have been fully ſatisfied firſt whether the *Hebrew* Text or the *Greek* Verſion was adulterated, eſpecially ſince the laſt is called by many in Queſtion, nay even looked upon as ſuppoſititious. Of which Opinion is the Learned Bp. of *Armagh*, who in a particular Treatiſe pretends to demonſtrate, that the true Verſion of the LXX Interpreters was always kept cloſe in the *Alexandrian* Library, no body being permitted to read, much leſs to tranſcribe it. That after the Burning of the ſaid Library another had been compiled, and ſubſtituted in the room of that of the LXX Interpreters about the time of *Ptolemæus Philadelphus*, which being approved of as genuine by ſome, was received by the Apoſtles and their Diſciples in the Church. 'Tis true, *Armachanus* has not many Followers in this

this Opinion; but there are not wanting such as believe that we have only Fragments of the true Version of the LXX Interpreters left now a-days, the rest being only Additions which are put upon the World under the same Name. *It appears to me*, says (o) *Bellarmine*, *probable that the Version of the LXX Interpreters is as yet extant, but so much vitiated and corrupted that it is scarce to be known.* And which way are we assured that the said Translation was made from the *Hebrew*? For if it was done from the *Samaritan* only, it carries not the same Weight with it as if it had been taken from the Original.

The Arguments of Vossius for his Hypothesis.

§. 5. The Arguments which *Vossius* alledges in behalf of the Translation of the LXX Interpreters, and its Preference before the *Hebrew* Text, may be comprehended under three several Heads: the first is the Authority and Consent of most Nations, as the *Ægyptians*, *Chinese* and others: The second is the Authority of all the Fathers of the Primitive Church. *Those who follow the common Computation* (p) (says he) *rely barely upon the Authority of the* Rabbins, *but we upon the the true sense of the* Hebrew *Text before it was adulterated by the* Jews. *We rely, I say, upon the Authority of the LXX Interpreters, of all the Fathers and the whole primitive Church, together with the Consent of all the most ancient Nations.* The third Objection is, that the Intervals related in the Genealogies of so numerous an Offspring are in no wise proportionable to their vast Number. The first Objection has been already answered by us in the first Chapter. The second is resolved by (q) *Gerard John Vossius* the Father of *Isaacus Vossius*, who says that the Intention of the Primitive Fathers and Councils being merely to promote those things which properly belong to the advancing

(o) Lib. 2. c. 6. de V. D. (p) Dissert. de ætat. mundi, p. 257. (q) De Nat. Christi, p. 250.

of

of the true Christian Faith, were not willing to enter into Disputes about these indifferent Matters, but retain'd the Translation of the LXX Interpreters, for the better Conveniency of such as were not versed in the *Hebrew* Tongue. In the third he relies upon a false Supposition, as if the ancient Fathers had not had a more numerous Offspring than what is expressly set down in the Books of *Moses*, whereas the Scripture only gives us some of their Genealogies, not an entire Catalogue of their Posterity, as has been well observed by (r) St. *Austin*.

Whether the 1656 Years till the Deluge were compleat Years.

§. 6. *Petavius*, with some of his Adherents, call in question whether the 1656 Years mentioned by *Moses* to have been betwixt the Creation of the World and the Deluge were compleat Years: But *Scaliger*, *Henr. Buntingus*, *Serbus Calvisius*, *Behmius*, *Frankenbergius* and *William Lange* positively affirm it. First because of the Age of *Methuselem*, it being said (s) *that* Methuselem *after he begot* Lamech, *lived* 782 *Years*. But if the Deluge began in the six hundredth Year of Noah's Age, *Methuselem* could not have lived above 781 years: for *Lamech* lived 182 Years when he begat (t) *Noah*. If to these be added 599 Years, which our Adversaries pretend to have been the Age of *Noah* at the time of the Deluge, the whole Product will amount to 781 Years, which is contrary to the express Words of *Moses*. Secondly, because *Moses* makes use of a Phrase in this Place, which always comprehends the Number of compleat Years. Thirdly, because the subsequent Intervals confirm it.

Whether the Deluge began in the Spring.

§. 7. *Henricus Buntingus*, and *Jacobus Haindinus*; but above all others, *Gerhardus Joannes Vossius*, are fully of Opinion that the Deluge began in the Spring, looking upon this Season as the most proper for the Propagation of those Creatures

(r) De Civ. Dei, l. 15. c. 15. (s) Gen. 5. v. 26. (t) Gen. 5. v. 28
(u) Isag. Chron. c. 5.

that

that went forth out of the Ark: And, that if it had hapned in Autumn they would have been in danger of periſhing by Famine by reaſon of the approaching Winter: Whereas the Spring Seaſon might furniſh them with ſufficient Alimony in a ſhort time. But it ſeems more probable to me, that the Deluge began in Autumn; becauſe the Ancients began their Year in Autumn, without queſtion in reſpect to the Epocha of the World, of which we have ſpoke in the firſt Chapter. And the ſacred Hiſtory tells us expreſly that the Deluge began in the ſecond Month. *This General Deſtruction* (ſays (x) *Joſephus*) *hapned in the ſix hundredth Year of* Noah, *in the ſecond Month, which is called among the* Macedonians *Dius, among the* Jews *Marſou, (and* commonly *Marcheſvan) according to the monthly Account of the* Egyptians. In anſwer to the Objections made by our Adverſaries againſt the Autumnal Seaſon, we alledge the Words of the Learned *Behmius* (y): *Did* Noah *give theſe Gentlemen any Account of what ſtores of Proviſions there was left when he went forth out of the Ark? Did not the whole Surface of the Earth furniſh a ſufficient Quantity of Dead Carcaſſes for the Voracious wild Beaſts to feed upon? Beſides what the Tops of the Mountains dunged with the ſlimy Relicts of the Waters, (z) and nouriſhed for five months, before by the Rays of the Sun might afford for their Suſtenance? And ſuppoſing ſome Animals did not procreate immediately after the Deluge; this could not create a Famine in* Noah's *Family.*

§. 8. There is a great Diſpute among the Chronologers concerning the forty Days Rain, and the Increaſe of the Waters for 150 Days, mentioned in the Relation of the Deluge. To enucleate which, we muſt look upon the Words of the Text in (a) *Geneſis*: *In the ſix hundredth*

Of the 40 Days Rain and 150 Days of the Increaſe of the Waters.

(x) L. 1. c. 3. Ant. (y) Man. Chron. p. 10. (z) Gen. 8. 5. (a) C. 7. v. 11. 17. 24.

year

year of Noah's *Life in the 2d Month, the 7th day of the month, the same day were all the Fountains of the great deep broken up, and the Windows of Heaven were opened, and the Rain was upon the Earth 40 Days and 40 Nights; and the Flood was 40 Days upon the Earth, and the Waters encreased, and bare up the Ark, and it was lift up above the Earth; and the Waters prevailed, and were encreased greatly upon the Earth, and the Ark went upon the face of the Waters; and the Waters prevailed exceedingly upon the Earth, and all the high Hills that were under the Heaven were covered; and the Waters prevailed (b) upon the Earth an hundred and fifty days; and the Waters returned from off the Earth continually; and after 150 days, the Waters were abated; and the Ark rested in the 7th Month, on the 17th day of the Month upon the Mountains of Ararat.* From these Words the *Jewish* Chronologers pretend to prove that the 40 Days ought not to be included in the 150; and that therefore the total Increase of the Waters of the Deluge lasted 190 Days; whereas on the other hand *Scaliger* is of opinion that the 40 Days are included in the 150. *Joannes Waltherus* looks upon this Question to be involved in such Difficulties as not to be easily resolved. But upon strict Examination of the whole History of the Deluge, it is no difficult Task to judge that *Scaliger's* Opinion is to be preferred before the other; it being said expressly that there were five Months pass'd from the beginning of the Deluge, when the Ark rested upon the Mountains of *Ararat.* Now if the 40 Days were not to be included in the 150 Days, it must of necessity follow, that each of these Months had contained 38 Days.

(b) Cap. 8. v. 3. 4.

§6

§. 9. There being ſo many various Opinions concerning the Univerſality of the Deluge, as well in reſpect of the Terreſtrial Globe, as the total Deſtruction of all its Inhabitants, we will give you a Scheme of the chiefeſt among them. *Various Opinions concerning the Univerſality of the Deluge.*

The firſt are the *Jews*, who extend this Univerſality of the Deluge, not only to all the Terreſtrial Creatures, but the Fiſh which, they ſay were ſuffocated by the Heat of the Rains and Waters which broke out of the deep Fountains of the Earth. There are ſecondly, alſo ſome among the *Jews* who deny this Univerſality of the Deluge, and pretend, that beſides the eight Perſons included in the Ark, *Ogg* the King of *Baſan* was preſerved. To the third Claſs belong the Scholaſticks, who are of opinion that *Enoch*, who at that time dwelled in the Paradiſe, was not involved in the Deluge. To the fourth Claſs belong thoſe who maintain, that not only a few Perſons, but whole Nations never felt the Effects of this great Inundation, but that the *Jews* only, and the other Inhabitants of *Paleſtina* periſhed in it. The fifth in order don't deny but that a total Deſtruction of the whole Humane Race was cauſed by the Deluge; yet ſo as that the whole Terreſtrial Globe was not overwhelmed by the Waters: which Opinion is founded upon two other Hypotheſes; to wit, That at the time of the Deluge the Earth remained as yet for the greateſt part deſolate without any Inhabitants; and that all the Waters of the Univerſe could not have been ſufficient to cauſe an univerſal Deluge. This *Abraham Mylius* pretends to demonſtrate, that if all the Waters of the Univerſe had been ſent down upon Earth, they could not have covered the Tops of the higheſt Mountains. (c) *Iſaacus Voſſius* approves of both theſe Hypotheſes. The ſixth and laſt are thoſe who have choſen the tru-

(c) Diſſ. de Ætat mundi, p. 284.

eſt

eſt Opinion, and maintain that the Deluge was Univerſal, both in reſpect of the Terreſtrial Globe and its Inhabitants; becauſe the Motive which induced God thus to puniſh the whole Earth was univerſal, God complains that every Imagination of the Thoughts of Man's Heart was only evil continually. (2.) God's Threats were univerſal without Exception: *I will deſtroy Man whom I have created, from the Face of the Earth, both Man and Beaſt, and the creeping thing, and the Fowls of the Air; for it repented me that I have made them.* (3.) The Execution was univerſal: (e) *All Fleſh died that moved upon the Earth, both of Fowl and of Cattle, and of Beaſt, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the Earth; and every Man.* (4.) The building of the Ark it ſelf was a convincing Argument for the Univerſality of the Deluge: For what elſe could have moved *Noah* to build it when he might have transferred himſelf with his Family to another Place: And (5.) It would have ſavoured much of Folly, if *Noah* had taken ſo much pains to gather all the Creatures in the Ark, if there had been enough left in other Places. To all this may be added the general Conſent of the Gentiles, who, tho' they have mixed their Relations of the Deluge with many of their Fables and Fictions; yet all agree in this Point, that it has been univerſal. It is for this reaſon I cannot ſufficiently admire how the Learned (f) St. *Auſtin* could be ſo much overſeen as to declare, that there were not the leaſt Footſteps of this Deluge to be met with in the *Greek* and *Latin* Authors; the contrary of which has been ſufficiently demonſtrated by (g) *Hugo Grotius.*

(d) Gen. 6. v. 5. 7. (e) Gen. 7. v. 21. (f) L. 18. c. 8. de Civ. Dei. (g) Lib. 1. de Relig.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Chaldæan *Epocha, and the Reigns of the* Assyrian *Monarchs.*

1. *The principal thing to be taken care of in this Epocha is, not to fix its beginning beyond that of the Deluge.*
2. *To be very cautious in contradicting the Authority of* Ctesias Cnidius, Diodorus Siculus, Æmilius Sura, Castor, Eusebius, *and some other Ancient Historians.*
3. *Care ought also to be taken, that the time of this Epocha be not contracted into too narrow a Compass, it being evident out of the Holy Scripture, that the* Chaldæan *and* Assyrian *Monarchy is very ancient.*
4. *The beginning of the* Chaldæan *or* Babylonian Æra *ought to be fixed at some remarkable time or other mentioned in their History, either from the first Foundation of their Capital City, or the Original of that Monarchy.*
5. *From the Beginning and first Institution of the* Chaldæan Æra, *till the time of* Alexander the Great, *are computed* 1903 *Years, according to* Callisthenes; Because, *says* (*b*) Simplicius, these Astronomical Observations which *Callisthenes*, (pursuant to the Instructions received from *Aristotle*) had sent to *Babylon*, were not then to be met with in *Græcia*; which, as *Porphyrius* affirms, were preserved 1903 Years; to wit, till the Times of *Alexander the Great.*
6. *The* Assyrian Monarchy *has lasted near* 1300 *years, according to* Ctesias Cnidius *and*

(*b*) Aristot. de Cœl. Libr.

(*i*) Dio-

(i) Diodorus Siculus, Æmilius Sura, *in* Velleius Paterculus, Trogus *in* Juſtin, (k) Euſebius, (l) St. Auſtin.

7. *The* Aſſyrian Monarchy *did already flouriſh at the time of* Abraham, *according to the Teſtimony of* (m) Joſephus, *who ſpeaking about the Expedition of* Abraham, *undertook againſt the four Kings, ſays, that it hapned at the time when the* Aſſyrians *were Maſters of* Aſia.

8. *It ſeems very probable that the* Aſſyrian Monarchy *began in the times of* Phaleg, *about which time alſo hapned the Confuſion of Tongues* (n).

9. *All the ancient Hiſtories both of the* Greeks *and* Barbarians *agree in this point, that the firſt Monarch of all* Aſia *was* Ninus *the Son of* Belus, *the Founder of the Capital City of the* Aſſyrians *of the ſame Name.*

10. Ninus *was not abſolutely the firſt King over the* Chaldæans *and* Aſſyrians, *but* Belus *reigned before him, according to* Caſtor *in* Euſebius. We have only mentioned *Belus*, but have begun our Hiſtory with the Reign of *Ninus*.

11. *The* Aſſyrian Monarchy *began to flouriſh about the ſame time when* Babylon *was either built or enlarged, and made the Royal Seat of that Empire, where* Nimrod *kept his Reſidence, as is manifeſt out of* (o) Geneſis *and* (p) Joſephus. *All the prophane Hiſtorians ſeem to agree in this, that* Babylon *was built by* Belus; *concerning which* Abydenus *with* Euſebius *ſays, Belus* built the Walls of *Babylon*. *And* Dorotheus Sidonius *in* Julius Firmicus.

Ἀρχαῖη Βαβυλῶν Τυρὶς Βήλοιο πόλισμα.

The ancient City of *Babylon*, the Work of *Belus* the *Tyrian*.

(i) Lib. 2. Bibl. (k) In Chron. (l) C. 17. c. 21. de civ. Dei. (m) L. 11. Ant. c. 10. (n) Gen. c. 11. v. 9. (o) C. 10. v. 10. (p) L. 1. Ant. c. 5. (q) Scr. Evang. L. 9. c. 4.

Curtius

(k) Curtius *makes mention of the Royal Residence of* Belus. (l) Ammianus Marcellinus *of the Temple of* Belus. (m) Pliny *of the* Sepulch. *of* Belus.

12. *The Observations therefore mentioned by* Porphyrius, *to have been made at* Babylon, *were begun in the Year of the* Julian Period 2481, *and the* Assyrian Monarchy *was founded by* Nimrod *or* Belus *in the Year of the* Julian Period 2538.

Any Year of the Julian Period *given to find the Year since the Beginning of this Epocha.*

13. *If therefore you subtract* 2480 *Years from any Year of the* Julian Period, *the Remainder will be the Year of the* Chaldæan Epocha; *and if in like manner you subtract* 2537 *Years from the same Year of the* Julian Period, *the Superplus will shew the Year since the Beginning of the* Assyrian Monarchy.

Concerning the Authority of Ctesias Cnidius.

§. 1. THere are not a few who call in question the Authority of *Ctesias Cnidius* concerning the Chronology of the first Monarchy. *I am not*, (says (n) *Christianus Schotanus*) *of the same Opinion with* Ctesias, *tho' I am not ignorant that most Historians have declared for him.* Two Objections are made against his Authority; First because *Plutarch* did in his time accuse him of Falshood in his Writings; and (o) *Photius* says, that his Books are filled up with Fables. Secondly, Because *Herodotus* has lived a considerable time before *Ctesias*, and consequently has a Prerogative before him. But neither of these two are sufficient to destroy the Authority of *Ctesias*: For as to the first, *Plutarch* and some others of the ancient Historians have objected as many Errors

(k) L. 5. c. 1. (l) L. 23. c. 20. (m) L. 1. c. 26. (n) In Bibl. de Sec. mund. act. p. 126. (o) Cod. 72.

to *Herodotus* as *Cteſias*: Neither ſee I any Reaſon why a whole Hiſtory ſhould be rejected by reaſon of ſome few Errors, eſpecially when we are deſtitute of others, from whence we might receive better Inſtructions; and that *Plutarch* did not call in queſtion his whole Hiſtory, but only ſome particular Paſſages. As to the ſecond, it is obſerved that *Cteſias* though he lived after *Herodotus*; yet being converſant in *Perſia* and *Aſſyria*, and having the Opportunity of inſpecting their Records and Annals, ought to be preferred before him. There being beſides this but forty Years difference betwixt the Computation made by *Herodotus* and that of *Cteſias*, it is much more ſafe to follow the latter, till *Herodotus*'s Followers can ſhew us more Authentick Monuments of Antiquity, which I much queſtion whether they will ever be able to effect.

How to reconcile two ſeveral Paſſages of Cteſias.

§. 2. *Diodorus Siculus* out of *Cteſias* gives us two different Computations concerning the time of the *Aſſyrian* Monarchy. Of the firſt he ſays thus: (*p*) *Under the Reign of* Sardanapalus, *the* Aſſyrian *Monarchy, after it had flouriſhed* 1360 *Years* (*according to* Cteſias Cnidius, Lib. 2.) *was devolved to the* Medians. Of the ſecond he has theſe Words: (*q*) *Thus the* Aſſyrian *Empire, which from the time of* Ninus *had laſted* 1400 *Years, was deſtroyed by the* Medians. To reſolve this Difficulty, it ſeems that the laſt Paſſage of *Diodorus Siculus*, as well as ſeveral others of this Author has been adulterated, it being manifeſt that according to *Cteſias*, the *Aſſyrian* Monarchy did not flouriſh much above 1300 Years. Thus much is

(*p*) Lib. 2. Bibl. p. 77. Edit. Rhodomic. (*q*) Codoman. Lib. p. 81.

certain

certain, that *Clemens Alexandrinus*, does not attribute more than 1300 Years to the *Assyrian* Monarchy out of *Diodorus* and *Ctesias*, which agrees exactly with the time mentioned in the *Eusebian* Fragments, collected by *Scaliger*.

§. 3. The following Table represents a Catalogue of the *Assyrian* Monarchs, according to *Eusebius* and *Africanus*, till the time of *Sardanapalus*. We have added to the Computation of *Eusebius*, the Year of the *Julian* Period, in which, according to this Hypothesis, each of these Kings began his Reign: And to the Computation of *Africanus* likewise the Year of the *Julian* Period pursuant to the Opinion of *Scaliger* and *William Lange*, out of which every one may choose such as he finds most suitable to his own Judgment.

The Names and Order of the Assyrian Monarchs.

Num. Afr.	Nom. & Num Reg. Euseb.	A.R. Eus.	Anni P. J.	A.R. Afr.	A.P.J. Scal.	A.P.J. Lang.
1	1. Belus.	60	2538	55	2357	2370
2	2. Ninus.	52	2598	52	2412	2425
3	3. Semiramis.	42	2650	42	2464	2477
4	4. Ninyas.	38	2692	38	2506	2519
5	5. Arius.	30	2730	30	2544	2557
6	6. Aralius.	40	2760	40	2574	2587
7	7. Xer. s. Bal.	30	2800	30	2614	2627
8	8. Armamith.	38	2830	38	2644	2657
9	9. Belochus.	35	2868	35	2682	2695
10	10. Baleus.	52	2903	52	2717	2730
11	11. Sethos s. Ait.	32	2955	32	2769	2782
12	12. Mamythus s. Mamintus.	30	2985	30	2801	2814
13	13. Mane. s. Asph.	28	3013	28	2831	2844
14	14. Sphaerus.	22	3041	22	2859	2872
15	15. Mamylus s. Mamythus.	30	3063	30	2881	2894
16	16. Spartheus s. Sparetus.	40	3093	42	2911	2924
17	17. Ascatades.	38	3133	38	2953	2966
18	18. Amyntes.	45	3171	45	2991	3004
19	19. Belochus.	25	3216	25	3036	3049
20	20. Balatores s. Bellepares.	30	3241	30	3061	3074
21	21. Lamprides.	30	3271	30	3091	3104
22	22. Sosares.	20	3301	20	3121	3134
23	23. Lampraes.	30	3321	30	3141	3154
24	24. Paoyas.	40	3351	45	3171	3184
25	25. Sosarmus.	22	3391	42	3216	3229
26	26. Mithraeus.	27	3418	27	3258	3271
27	27. Teutamus. s. Teutanes	32	3445	32	3285	3298
28	28. Teutaeus.	44	3477	44	3317	3330
29	Arabelus.			42	3361	3374
30	Chalaus.			45	3403	3416

Num.

Num. Afr.	Nom. Num. Regum Euseb.	A.R. Eus.	Ann. P. J.	A.R. Afr.	A.P.J. Scal.	A.P.J. Lang.
31	*Anabus.*			38	3448	3461
32	*Babius.*			37	3486	3499
33	29. *Thineus.*	30	3521	30	3523	3536
34	30. *Dercylus.*	40	3551	40	3553	3566
35	31. *Eupacmes. f. Eupales.*	38	3591	38	3593	3606
36	32. *Laosthenes.*	45	3629	45	3631	3644
37	33. *Pyritiades.*	30	3647	30	3676	3689
38	34. *Ophrateus.*	21	3704	21	3706	3718
39	35. *Ephachares. f. Ophratenes.*	52	3825	52	3727	3739
40	36. *Ocrazerès f. Acracarnes.*	42	3777	42	3779	3791
41	37. *Sardanapal.*	19	3819	20	3821	3833
The whole Time and End is.		1300	3838	1484	3841	3852

§. 4. Because *Eusebius* has left out four Kings, which are inserted in the Catalogue of *Africanus*, and consequently his Computation falls 162 Years short of the other; he has not escaped the Censures of the Chronologers. (r) *Joseph. Scaliger* says that *Eusebius* did this for no other Reason, but to make the Reign of *Teutamus* coincident with the *Trojan* War. On the other hand (s) *Petavius* speaks much in the Commendation of *Eusebius*, because he would not follow his Footsteps when he found them to be erroneous. *What should move* (says he) *Eusebius, rather to follow* Africanus *than* Diodorus, Ctesias, *and several other Historians, who attribute no more than* 1300 *Years to the* Assyrian *Monarchy?* I agree thus far with *Petavius*, as the *Eusebian* Catalogue is consonant to the Computation of the Holy Scriptures; whereas that of

Concerning the difference betwixt Eusebius *and* Africanus.

(r) In Animadv. ad Euseb. (s) l. 9 c. 12. de doct. temp.

Africanus relies barely upon the Computation of the Septuagint: Neither ought it to be pass'd by in Silence here, that the Hypothesis of *Eusebius* is confirmed by the Authority of (t) *Diodorus Siculus*. These are his Words: *The Supplies of Men sent by the* Assyrians, *under the Command of* Memnon *the Son of* Tithon, *to the* Trojans, *deserve also to be remembred here: For under the Reign of* Teutamus, *the twentieth King after* Ninyas *the Son of* Semiramis, *that ruled over all* Asia, *the* Greeks *engaged in a War against the* Trojans *under their General* Agamemnon *above a thousand Years after the* Assyrians *had been Masters of* Asia. Out of these Words of *Diodorus* it is apparent that *Eusebius* was not the only Person who had made the Reign of *Teutamus* coincident with the time of the *Trojan* War, though at the same time it is evident by our Hypothesis that all the ancient Historians who are of the same Opinion, are in a gross Error for having mistaken *Teutamus* for *Thinæus*.

Concerning the Opinion of Africanus.

§. 5. It has been shewed before how *Africanus* made his Computation according to the Number of Years attributed to the Reign of each of the *Assyrian* Monarchs, in which he has been egregiously mistaken: For if 1484 Years be subtracted from the 3838 Years of the *Julian* Period (which proved fatal to *Sardanapalus*) the beginning of the *Assyrian* Monarchy will thus fall in the Year 2354 of the *Julian* Period a considerable time before the Deluge, which did not happen till in the Year 2420 of the *Julian* Period. But *Africanus* being misled into this Error by the Computation of the *Greeks* or the LXX Interpreters, had consequently no Opportunity of making Reflexion upon the Absurdity that must needs ensue of the *Assyrian* Kings Reigns at the time of the Deluge. It is much more to be ad-

(t) Lib. 2. Bibl. hist.

mired

mired how (*u*) *Josephus Scaliger*, who in all other Matters constantly adheres to the *Hebrew* Computation, should in this Point be so much taken with the Hypothesis of *Africanus*; especially since (according to his own Supposition) the Deluge began in the Year 2420 of the *Julian* Period.

§. 6. *Herodotus* speaks thus concerning the *Assyrian* Empire: *After the* Assyrians *had ruled in* Asia *about* 520 *Years, the* Medians *were the first who bravely asserted their Liberty after they had shaken off the* Assyrian *Yoke, other Nations followed their Example.* Besides several others, *Jacobus Usserius*, and *Christianus Schotanus* consent with *Herodotus* in this Point. But *Herodotus*'s Authority alone could never be prevailing enough with me to detract so much from all the other most ancient Historians Reputation, as to look upon their Relations as so many Fables or Fictions. For first, according to *Plutarch* himself, nothing is more common than for *Herodotus* to be in a Mistake in the Relations of these things which were transacted before his time. Secondly, it is worth Observation, that *Herodotus* only made mention of the *Assyrian* Empire, as it was, by the bye; so that his Words cannot be supposed to come in Competition with the Histories of these Authors, who having had the Opportunity of searching narrowly into the Transactions of the *Assyrians*, have transmitted their Monuments to Posterity. Thirdly, the Words of *Herodotus* which follow immediately after the above-mentioned Passage, in which he pretends to impose upon the World (as shall be demonstrated hereafter) that the *Medians* lived without Kings till the time of *Dejoces*, render his Assertion concerning the *Assyrian* Empire very suspicious. Fourthly, as the Ancient City of *Nineve*

Concerning the Opinion of Herodotus *of the* Assyrian Monarchy.

(*u*) Can. Isag. p. 131.

is an unquestionable Argument for the Antiquity of its Founder *Ninus*; so it plainly demonstrates the Ignorance of *Herodotus*. Fifthly, the Words in the above-mentioned Passage are so dubious and obscure that it is impossible for any body as much as to guess from thence at the beginning or end of the *Assyrian* Monarchy; there being not the least mention made from who's Kings Reign it was, that *Herodotus* intended to begin his Computation; nor by what fatal Accident and under what King a Period was put to this Monarchy: Not to mention here that some are of Opinion that this Passage in *Herodotus* is suppositious.

Objection against the Intervals betwixt the Deluge and Beginning of the Assyrian Monarchy.

§. 7. The main Objection made against that Interval which we have set betwixt the Deluge and the Epocha of the *Assyrian* Monarchy is, how eight People that went forth out of the Ark of *Noah* could be sufficient to produce in so little a time so numerous a Stock as to suffice for the erecting so potent an Empire, which is the reason that St. (*x*) *Austin* has extended this Interval to a thousand Years. Of the same Opinion is also (*y*) *Isaacus Vossius*, who ridicules those that pretend to answer this Objection, by a Supposition that the Patriarchs began to procreate Children under the Age of twelve. But (*z*) *Dionysius Petavius* has attempted another way to satisfie the World in this Scruple, by supposing only (which will be granted without Reluctancy by every body) that they began to procreate at 17 years of Age; from whence, by multiplying the Number of 8, and its Product with 8, he demonstrates that a vast Number of People must needs have been procreated in two hundred sixty and one years time by so long-lived a Generation as was the first Posterity of *Noah*, as may be seen out of the following Computation.

(*x*) L. 8. c. 22. de Civ. Dei. (*y*) Diss. de ætat. mund. p. 257. (*z*) Lib. 9. c. 14. de doctr. temp.

Anni

Anni à Diluv.	*Num. Genitorum.*
VIII	8
XXXI	64
LIV	512
LXXVII.	4096
C	32768
CXXIII	262144
CXLVI	2097152
CLXIX	16777216
CXCII	134217728
CCXV	1073741824
CCXXXVIII	8589934592
CCLXI	68719476736

§ 8. There is also no small Contest among the Historians concerning the first Monarch or King of the *Assyrians*; Some following the Footsteps of the *Pseudo Berosus* mention, one *Saturn*, who, they say, reigned 56 Years. Others maintain that the *Babylonian* Empire was divided into three Principalities, the first of which was that of the *Chaldæans*, whose first King was *Evechoos* (whom some will have to have been the same with *Ninus*:) The second of the *Arabians*, whose first King was one *Mardocentes*: The third, of the *Assyrians*, whose first King was *Belus*: Of which you may consult (a) *Scaliger*, *Christianus Schotanus*, and *Isaacus Vossius* in his Treatise of the second Age of the World. But it appears most probable to me, that the *Babylonian* Empire was always under the Jurisdiction of one single Monarch, till the time of *Sardanapalus*; and that *Nimrod*, of whom mention is made in

Who was the first Assyrian Monarch.

(a) Lib 2 p. 131.

(b)

(b) *Geneſis*, was the ſame *Belus* whoſe Name is ſo famous in prophane Hiſtory. 'Tis true that (c) *Euſebius* mentions alſo one *Saturn*, but he adds expreſly that he believes him to have been the ſame with *Belus*. What concerns the two Principalities, which *Scaliger* and *Schotanus* (according to *Africanus*) pretend to have been before the time of *Belus*, they are to be look'd upon as mere Fictions; as being contradictory to the Sacred Writ, and the true Epocha of the Deluge it ſelf, or at leaſt to its Univerſality.

The Obſervation of Scaliger concerning the Aſſyrian Monarchy.

§. 9. (d) *Scaliger* has made a very uſeful Obſervation concerning the *Aſſyrian* Empire, that it has been more famous for its Antiquity than its Greatneſs: For though its Power and Extent was very vaſt in the Beginning, yet the *Aſſyrian* Monarchs giving themſelves over afterwards to all manner of Voluptuouſneſs and becoming careleſs of the Publick Welfare, many of the Conquer'd Nations ſhook off the *Aſſyrian* Yoke, What is mentioned in the Books of the Judges and of the Kings in the Sacred Writ concerning the King of *Babylon*, the *Syrians* and ſome other Nations bordering upon *Paleſtina*, not acknowledging the Juriſdiction of the *Aſſyrian* King, ſeems to be underſtood, not of the moſt ancient *Aſſyr. Monarchy* when in its flouriſhing State, under the Reigns of *Nimrod* and *Ninus*, but of its later times, when this Monarchy already began to be in a declining Condition. Of which ſee *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus Lib.* 1. *Antiq. Rom.*

Political Obſervations concerning this Monarchy.

§. 10. The Obſervations made concerning the Policy of the ancient *Aſſyrian* Monarchy by *Rob. Bailius*, ought not to be paſs'd by in Silence; For after *Ninus* and *Semiramis* with

(b) C. 10. v. 9. 10. (c) Lib. 1. Chron. (d) 3 Can. Iſag.

their

their vaſt Armies had overpowered far diſtant Nations, their Succeſſors chief Maxims of State tended only to this, How to keep what they had got, not to extend their Conqueſts: For which Reaſon they built the moſt magnificent Palace of *Ninive*; where they always kept themſelves very cloſe, being very ſeldom to be ſeen by any body but their neareſt Servants, whereby they imprinted into the Minds of the People an extraordinary Character of their Majeſty, as having ſomething much above the common Rank of Mankind, whilſt they themſelves devoted themſelves wholly to all manner of Voluptuouſneſs. Beſides this, they drew every Year a vaſt Number of Soldiers out of the Provinces under their Juriſdiction, who being quartered in and about the City of *Ninive*, and commanded by ſuch a one as was thought moſt faithful: Theſe Forces ſtruck Terror both in the Subjects living in the Center of the Empire, and the other Nations under their Juriſdiction. This Army was alſo disbanded, and the General as well as the Governours of the Provinces changed every Year, whereby they took away all Opportunity of putting them in a Condition to invade the Empire. Thus the *Aſſyrian* Empire continued for 1300 Years, till the time of *Sardanapalus*, when the *Medians* put an End to this Monarchy.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Of the Epocha's of the Years of Abraham.

1. *The time of the Birth of* Abraham *muſt be look'd for in the* 11*th Chapter of* Geneſis, *which contains an exact Account of the Ages of the Patriarchs after the Deluge.*
2. *The Year of the Birth of* Abraham *ought to be coincident with the ſeventieth Year of* Thara *(a).*
3. *According to the* Moſaick *Computation, the Interval betwixt the Deluge and* Abraham *is of* 292 *Years.*
4. Abraham *was born when the* Aſſyrian *Monarchy flouriſhed in* Aſia, *according to St.* Auſtin *(b).*
5. *The Vocation of* Abraham *was in the* 75*th year of his Age (c).*
6. *From the* 75*th year of his Age, (being that of his Vocation) begins the Epocha of the time of the Children of* Iſrael's *abiding in* Ægypt, *being* 430 *years, till the time of their going out of* Ægypt; *from whence to reckon backwards to the Nativity of* Abraham, *are* 505 *years (d).*
7. Iſaac *was born when* Abraham *was* 100 *years old (e).*
8. Abraham *died when he was* 175 *years old (f).*
9. *According to this Computation* Abraham *was born in the year* 2712 *of the* Julian *Period, in*

(*a*) Gen. 11. v. 26. (*b*) L. 16. c. 17. de Civ. Dei. (*c*) Gen. 12. v. 4. (*d*) Gal. 3. v. 17. Joſ. L. 2. c. 6. Antiq. (*e*) Gen. 21. v. 5. (*f*) Gen. 25. v. 7.

the

the 24th Cycle of the Sun, and the 16th of the Moon. The Vocation of Abraham *happed in the year 2787 of the* Julian *Period, the Birth of* Isaac *in the year 2812 of the* Julian *Period, and the Death of* Abraham *in the year 2887 of the same Period.*

10. *If therefore from any certain year of the* Julian *Period be subtracted 2711 years for the Nativity of* Abraham, *2786 for his Vocation, 2811 for the Birth of* Isaac, *and 2886 years for the Death of* Abraham, *the Residue will shew the desired year of the Epocha of* Abraham. *On the other hand, if the above-mentioned Numbers of years be added to the year of the Epocha of* Abraham, *the Products will be correspondent to the years of the* Julian *Period.*

Any year of the Julian *Period given to find the Year since the beginning of this Epocha.*

§. 1. THE following Table represents the several Computations of the Interval betwixt the Deluge and the Birth of *Abraham*.

Of the Computation of the Interval betwixt the Deluge and the Birth of Abraham.

From the Deluge,	*According to the* He.	*LXX Int.*	*Josephus.*	*Genesis* xi
To *Arphaxad,*	2	2	12	*Verse* 10
To *Cainaan,*	0	135	135	
Salah,	35	130	130	*Verse* 12
Eber,	30	130	130	*Verse* 14
Phaleg,	34	134	134	*Verse* 16
Ragau,	30	130	130	*Verse* 18
Serug,	32	132	130	*Verse* 20
Nachor,	30	130	132	*Verse* 22
Thara,	29	79	129	*Verse* 24
Abraham,	70	70	130	*Verse* 29
The whole Sum of years from the Del. to Abrah.	292	1072	1192	

Both

Both the Computation of the LXX Interpreters and that of *Josephus* is taken out of *Isaacus* (g) *Vossius*, who, as well as (h) *Bryon Walton*, follow in the Intervals of Years, both before and after the Deluge, the Computation of the *Greeks*.

Whether Arphaxad *was born in the* 2d *or* 12th *year after the Deluge.*

§. 2. (i) *Isaacus Vossius* follows the Footsteps of *Josephus* in the time of the Birth of *Arphaxad*, being of Opinion that in *Genesis* 11. v. 10. where it is said *Shem* was an hundred years old, and begat *Arphaxad* two years after the Deluge, it should be said twelve; which Error he attributes to the Carelessness of the Amanuensis, *For*, says he, *how else could* Arphaxad *have two elder Brothers*, Elam *and* Assur? *for among the Sons of* Shem, Arphaxad *is mentioned in the third place: And to suppose that these three Sons, and perhaps as many Daughters, were all born in two years time, is ridiculous. But the Computation of* Josephus *is free from all these Difficulties, especially concerning the Age of Shem.* To this it is answered by some, that the Opinion of *Vossius* being contrary both to the *Hebrew* Text, and the Translation of the Septuagint, it may rationally be supposed, that the two elder Brothers of *Arphaxad* were either Twins born in the first year after the Deluge; or that *Shem*'s Wife conceived whilst she was in the Ark, and immediately after brought forth the Eldest, and in a years time after, the Second. There are also some who believe *Arphaxad* to have been the First-born; because it is said in *Genesis* 11. 2. that *Shem*, after he begat *Arphaxad*, begat Sons and Daughters, and not before.

(g) Dissert. de ætat. Mundi. c. 8 (h) Chronol. Sacr. p. 108. (i) Chron. Sacr. p. 107.

3.

§. 3. There is another difficulty in the Genealogy of the Post-Diluvian Patriarchs concerning *Cainan*, who in the Translation of the LXX Interpreters is put betwixt *Arphaxad* and *Salah*. These are their Words in *Gen.* 10. *v.* 24. *And* Arphaxad *begot* Cainan, Cainan *begot* Salah. And in the 11th Chapter, v. 11. *And* Arphaxad *lived* 130 *years and begot* Cainan. And the first of Chronicles, Chap. 1. v. 27. *And* Arphaxad *begat* Cainan, *and* Cainan *begot* Salah. *Cainan* is also mentioned in the 3d Chapter, v. 35. of St. *Luke*, *which was the Son of* Salah, *which was the Son of* Cainan, *which was the Son of* Arphaxad. The *Syriack*, *Latin*, *German*, *Low-Dutch*, and *English* Translations do not only follow the Footsteps of the LXX Interpreters in this Point, but also among our Modern Authors, *Alphonsus Salmero*, *Augustus Torniellus*, *Jacobus Saltanus*, *Isaacus Vossius*, and *Bryon Walton*, who relying upon the Authority of St. *Luke*, agrees with them in Opinion. But there are very weighty Reasons which have moved others to contradict this Assertion. For, first, in the *Hebrew* Text no mention is made of *Cainan*: 2. In some of the most ancient Translations of the Bible, especially in the *Samaritan*, as also by (*k*) *Josephus*, otherwise a strict Adherer to the Chronology of the Septuagint, no mention is made of *Cainan*. 3. In some ancient Copies of the Gospel of St. *Luke*, *Cainan* is likewise not mentioned; as in that of *Theodorus Beza*, where *Arphaxad* is put immediately after *Salah*, which has moved *Theodatus* and *Cartwightus*, the first to leave him out in his *Italian*, the last in his *Latin* Translation: And *Usserius* cites above twelve of the Fathers and Ecclesiastical Writers, who know nothing of this *Cainan*. 4. There are also some who are of Opinion that *Salah* had a double Name,

Of Cainan who is put betwixt Arphaxad and Salah.

(*k*) Lib. 1. c. 6. ant.

his

his ſecond Name being *Cainan*; and that there ought to have been no diſtinction in St. *Luke* betwixt theſe two Names. 5. Others will have it, that the LXX Interpreters have inſerted this *Cainan* on purpoſe to make *Moſes* agree with the *Ægyptian* Hiſtory. But be it as it will, my Opinion is, that the Computation of *Moſes* cannot be erroneous, *Ger. Jo. Voſſius* has made this uſeful Obſervation (*l*), that becauſe neither *Epiphanius* nor St. *Hierom* (*m*) make the leaſt mention of *Cainan*, neither the ſaid *Cainan* is to be found in the beſt *Roman* Edition of the Septuagint, publiſhed by the Care of *Caraffa*, it is very probable that in the original Manuſcript of the LXX Interpreters no mention was likewiſe made of *Cainan*.

Whether the Birth of Abraham was coincident with the 70th Year of Thara.

§. 4. The Words of *Moſes* concerning the Nativity of *Abraham* are as follows: (*n*) *And* Thara *lived 70 years and begat* Abraham, Nachor *and* Haran. From which Words the Chronologers conclude, that *Abraham* was not above 70 years younger than his Father *Thara*. 1. Becauſe *Moſes* having been ſo exact in mentioning the 75th year of the Age of *Abraham*, as alſo the 86th (*o*), and the (*p*) 99th, it ſeems very improbable he ſhould have neglected that of his Nativity. 2. Becauſe in the Catalogue of the Children of *Thara*, he gives the Preference to *Abraham*. In 1 *Chron.* 1. *v.* 28. *Iſrael* is put before *Iſmael* his elder Brother; but what wonder if he had the Preference given him before the Son of his Father's Maid. Otherwiſe it is obſervable that the Scripture always relates the Genealogy of thoſe born in Wedlock in the ſame Order as they were born. This is manifeſt in the Children of *Rachel*, who, though much beloved by their Father, yet are inſerted accord-

(*l*) Hæreſ. 55. contra Melchiſ. (*m*) In Trad. Ebraic. (*n*) Gen. 11. v. 26. (*o*) Gen. 16. v. 16. (*p*) Gen. 12. 4. and 17. v. 24.

ing

ing to the time of their Nativities. And even he who had ſold the Prerogative of his Birth-right, yet is mentioned as the eldeſt in the Sacred Hiſtory. 3. Becauſe *Abraham* ſeemed to be ſtartled at the Promiſe made him, looking upon it as an Example without a Parallel, to be bleſſed with a Son when he was 100 years old (*r*). But it is not probable that *Abraham* would have conſidered it as a miraculous thing, if he himſelf had been born (according to the Opinion of ſome in the 130th year of his Father *Thara*'s Age.

Of the time of the Departure of Abraham *out of* Haran.

§. 5. And there ariſes another Difficulty in the Sacred Chronology concerning the time of the Departure of *Abraham* out of *Haran*, it being ſaid by *Moſes* that (*s*) Abraham *was* 75 *years old when he departed out of* Haran; and by St. (*t*) *Stephen, that he removed from thence when his Father was dead:* From whence it is evident, that if 70 years of *Thara*, when he begat *Abraham*, be added to 75, the Age of *Abraham* when he removed out of *Haran*, the Product will be 145 years; whereas (*u*) *Moſes* ſays of *Thara, that his Days were* 205 *years, and that he died in* Haran: Which has moved St. *Hierom* and *Scaliger* to look upon this Queſtion as the *Gordian* Knot. Others, among whom are *Nicholas de Lyra, Calvinus, Cajetanus, Martyr, Torniellus, Muſculus, Beroaldus, Salianus, Pareus, Junius, Henricus Philippi, Jacobus Capellus, Ludovicus Capellus, Temporarius, Uſſerius, Iſaacus Voſſius*, and ſeveral more, pretend to reſolve this Knotty Queſtion, by aſſerting that *Abraham* was begot by *Thara* when he was 130 years old; and that the Words in *Geneſis*, Thara *lived* 70 *years and begat* Abraham, Nahor *and* Haran, are to be underſtood thus: That *Thara* was 70 years old when he began

(*r*) Gen. 17. v. 17. (*s*) Gen. 12. v. 4. (*t*) Acts 7. v. 4. (*u*) Gen. 11. v. 32.

to beget Children, among whom was *Abraham* (who had the Preference, as being the Father of the Believers) *Nahor* (the Firſt-born) and *Haran* (the Second;) but the Diſſolution of this *Gordian* Knot is owing to St. *Auſtin*, who is of Opinion that *Abraham* did at leaſt depart twice out of *Haran*, but did not fix his Habitation in *Canaan* till the ſecond time. With St. *Auſtin* agree in this Point *Brentius*, *Geſnerus*, *Pererius*, *Cornelius à Lapide*, *Alphonſus Toſtatus*, *Lorinus*, *Robertus Bailius*, *Dionyſius Petavius*, and others.

Of the erroneous Computation of Euſebius.

§. 6. *Euſebius* in his Computation of the years of *Abraham* is fallen into an Error, when he affirms the Interval of time betwixt the beginning of the *Julian* Period and the Nativity of *Abraham* to have been 2696 years and 9 months; whereas according to the Calculation of the *Hebrew* Text, the ſame hapned in the year 2712; which is the true Reaſon that ſome who were not ſenſible of this erroneous Computation of *Euſebius*, have been miſ-guided in many of the following Epocha's.

Abraham *is mentioned in Prophane Hiſtory.*

§. 7. There are ſome who are of Opinion that not the leaſt Footſteps of this Epocha of *Abraham* are to be found in prophane Hiſtory: But theſe may be convinced of their Miſtake by (*x*) *Joſephus*, who alledges the Words of the true and ancient (not the ſuppoſititious) *Beroſus*: *In the tenth Generation after the Deluge there lived a juſt and great Man among the* Chaldæans, *who among other things, was well verſed in* Aſtronomy. And in (*y*) *Juſtin* we find the Teſtimony of *Trogus Pompeius*: *The* Jews, ſays he, *have their Offspring from* Damaſcus, *a famous City of* Syria: *their Kings were* Abraham *and* Iſrael. See alſo *Clement Alexandrinus* and *Euſebius*, *L.* 13. *c.* 12 (*z*).

(*x*) L. 1. c. 8. Ant. (*y*) L. 36 c. 2. (*z*) Strom. V.

CHAP

CHAP. VI.

Of the Epocha of the CCCCXXX Years the Jews *ſojourned in* Ægypt; *of which mention is made in* Exodus 12. *Verſe* 40.

1. *The beginning of this Epocha muſt be congruous to the time of that ſolemn Promiſe mentioned in* (*a*) Geneſis, *to have been made to* Abraham.
2. *Due Regard ought to be had to the Age of the Forefathers of* Moſes, *as deſcribed in* Exodus (*b*).
3. *The End of it muſt be coincident with the time of their leaving of* Ægypt.
4. *The Number of the Generations of the* Levitical *Families recited in the above-mentioned Places ought alſo carefully to be obſerved.*
5. *The ſame Reſpect muſt be had to the other Intervals.*
6. *Care muſt be taken, that not any thing be inferr'd contradictory to the Teſtimony of* Joſephus *in his 2d Book of Antiquities, Chap.* 5. They left, *ſays he,* Ægypt in the Month of *Xanthicus*, in the 430th Year after the Coming of our Father *Abraham* into *Canaan*; and in the 215th Year after the Migration of *Jacob* into *Ægypt*, *Moſes* was then in his 80th Year of Age, and his Brother *Aaron* three years elder than he.
7. *Accordingly we affirm, that the firſt year of this Epocha was coincident with the 76th year*

(*a*) C. 12. v. 3. c. 15. ad Gal. 3. v. 17. (*b*) C. 6. v. 19, 20.

of the Age of Abraham, *which was the* 2787*th year of the* Julian *Period, Cycle* ☉. 15. ☽. 13. *and its End in the Year* 3217 *of the* Julian *Period.*

Any year given of the Julian *Period to find the year since the beginning of this Epocha.*

8. *If therefore* 2780 *years be subtracted from any certain year of the* Julian *Period, the Residue will shew the year of this Epocha: But if the same be added to any certain year of this Epocha, the Product will be correspondent to the year of the* Julian *Period. There is not any Certainty concerning the Months, they being not mentioned in the Holy Scripture: for the Traditions of* Rabbi Solomon, *who asserts, that God did make his Covenant with* Abraham *in the Month of* Nisan, *is no more Authentick than the rest of the* Jewish *Traditions.*

Whether the Hebrew *Text be corrupted concerning these* 430 *years.*

§. 1. (c) *Morinus* and (d) *Isaacus Vossius* are of Opinion that the *Hebrew* Text concerning the 430 years of the sojourning of the *Israelites* in *Ægypt* has been adulterated, and therefore prefer the *Samaritan* and *Greek* Translations: In the first it is said thus; *The sojourning of the Children of* Israel *and their Forefathers who dwelt in the Land of* Canaan *and* Ægypt, *was four hundred and thirty years:* Whereas in the *Hebrew* Text it is thus expres'd by *Moses*; *The sojourning of the Children of* Israel, *who dwelt in* Ægypt *was four hundred and thirty years.* But besides the Divine Testimony of the unquestionable and most authentick Authority of the *Hebrew* Text, (e) St. *Matthew* and St. (f) *Luke*, and in other Places, the *Chaldæan*, vulgar *Latin* and *Arabick* Translations are sufficient to attest the genuine Lection of the *Hebrew* Text in this Place, as well as the fre-

(c) Exerc. Bibl. (d) Chron. sacr. c. 2. p. 3. (e) C. 5. v. 18. (f) C. 16. v. 17.

quent

quent Allegations of many of the moſt ancient Authors.

§. 2. There are not a few who pretend to begin this Epocha from the time of *Jacob*'s going into *Ægypt*, of which we read in (*g*) *Geneſis*, but according to this Hypotheſis, it is impoſſible to compleat the Number of 430 years of the *Iſraelites* ſojourning in *Ægypt*; for it being ſaid (*h*) that *Jacob came into Ægypt with* Kohath *the Son of* Levi; if the whole Age of *Kohath* be computed as well as that of his Son *Amram* (the firſt being of 133, the laſt of 137 (*i*) Years) and the 80 Years of *Moſes* when he ſpoke to *Pharaoh*, be added to them both, the whole does not exceed 350 Years, which is 80 Years leſs than 430 Years; from whence it's evident that our preceding Computation is to be preferr'd before this, it being eſpecially confirmed by the Authority of the *Jewiſh Rabbi*'s and moſt of the *Greek* and *Latin* Authors. The *Greeks*, according to the Tranſlation of the LXX Interpreters, whoſe Words are theſe: *The ſojourning of the Children of* Iſrael *and their Forefathers who dwelt in the Land of* Ægypt *and in the Land of* Canaan, *they and their Fathers, were* 450 *years*. But the *Latin* Interpreters have followed in this Point the Footſteps of the two Learned Fathers St. *Jerom* and St. *Auſtin*. *Theſe* 430 *years*, ſays the firſt, (*k*) *are to be computed from the time when God ſaid unto* Abraham, *And in thee ſhall all the Families of the Earth be bleſſed. There are to be computed* (ſays St. *Auſtin*) 430 *years from the* 75*th year of the Age of* Abraham, *when the firſt Promiſe was made unto him by God, till the time of the Children of* Iſrael's *going out of* Ægypt; with whom agrees *Gregorius Syncellus*, who affirms

This Epocha has not it's beginning from the time of Jacob's *going into* Ægypt.

(*g*) C. 46. (*h*) Gen. 46. v. 11. (*i*) Exod. 7. v. 7. (*k*) C. 3. Ep. ad Gal.

that the 430 years of the ſojourning of the Children of *Iſrael* in the Land of *Canaan* and *Ægypt*, ought, according to the Opinion of all the Interpreters and Hiſtorians, to be computed from the 75th year of *Abraham*.

The Jews agree with our Opinion in this point.

§. 3. The *Jewiſh* Interpreters agree in this Point in their Opinion with the *Latines*; *The true Explication*, ſays *Rabbi Levi*, *of theſe* 430 *years is to be ſought for in theſe Words, and to be begun from the time when God ſaid unto* Abraham, *Thy Seed ſhall be a Stranger in a Land that is not theirs.* Of the ſame Opinion are likewiſe *Rabbi Solomon, Seder Olam, Michilta Rabah, El Pharao, Schemoth Rabah*, and *Tanchuma Schemot*.

The Opinions of Eugubinus, Genebrard. *and* G. J. Voſ *refuted.*

§. 4. *Eugubinus*, *Genebrardus* and *Gerhardus Johannes Voſſius* begin this Epocha from the time of the going of *Jacob* into *Ægypt*, and the laſt from the time of *Joſeph*'s being ſold into *Ægypt*. 1. Becauſe that in (*l*) *Exodus* and the (*m*) *Acts*, as well as in (*n*) *Geneſis*, there is only mention made of their dwelling in *Ægypt*, not in the Land of *Canaan*. 2. They look upon it as incongruous to the true Senſe of the Scripture, that their dwelling in *Canaan* ſhould be accounted a Servitude or Exile. 3. They alledge in their behalf, the Paſſage in the Hiſtory of (*o*) *Judith*; where it is ſaid, when the Earth was overwhelmed with Famine, they went into *Ægypt*, where in 400 years they encreaſed into an innumerable Multitude. To the firſt Argument we have already anſwered with the Words of St. *Auſtin*. As to the ſecond, they are extreamly miſtaken in their Explication, when they have put the Fore-fathers of the *Iſraelites* in the Poſſeſſion of the Land of *Canaan*; whereas according to the (*p*) *Acts*, Abraham *had no Inheritance in it, no not ſo much as to ſet his Foot on.* And in the Epiſtle to the

(*l*) Ex. 12. v. 40. (*m*) Acts 7. v. 6. c. 13. v. 16. (*n*) Gen. 15. v. 13. (*o*) C. 5. (*p*) C. 7. v. 5.

(*q*) He-

(q) *Hebrews*, they are ſaid *to have been Strangers and Pilgrims there.* The third may be refuted out of *Voſſius* himſelf, who, though of a contrary Opinion, yet is forced to confeſs that the Argument taken from the Hiſtory of *Judith* is of no great Weight, *Achior* being introduced by the Author there as a Foreigner, who, perhaps might not have a full Inſight into the Tranſactions and Chronology of the *Jews*.

Some deduce this Epocha from the Nativity of Iſaac.

§. 5. St. (r) *Auſtin's* Words ſufficiently teſtifie that ſome among the Ancients have been of Opinion that this Epocha of 430 years ought to begin with the Nativity of *Iſaac*; and ſome of the *Jewiſh* Interpreters have conſtantly affirmed the ſame; aud have of late Years been followed by *Sieurs de Dieu* and *Ludovicus Langius*, the laſt of whom (s) ſays, *It is very evident that* Abraham *was born in the* 130*th year of* Thara, *and conſequently in the* 2680*th year of the* Julian *Period; and that he begot Iſaac when he was* 100 *years old, which was the Seed promiſed to him before; from whence, till the time of the Promulgation of the Law, are to be computed the* 430 *years mentioned by* St. Paul (t), *&c.* But the Hypotheſis of *Langius* is built upon a wrong Foundation, there being nothing mentioned concerning the Nativity of *Iſaac* either in the *Hebrew* Text or that of St. *Paul*: And as to what relates to the Nativity of *Abraham* in the 130th year of *Thara*, has been refuted before.

(q) Heb 11. v. 13. (r) L. 16. c. 24. de civ. Dei. (s) L. 2. c. 4. de an. Chriſti. (t) Gal. 3. v. 17.

CHAP. VII.

Of the Epocha of Inachus, *the Founder of the Kingdom of* Argos *in* Peloponneſus, *and his Succeſſors.*

1. *As the moſt Ancient* Greek *Hiſtory owes its Foundation to the Memory of* Inachus *King of* Argos, *ſo in fixing the beginning of the Epocha of this King, the Footſteps of* Caſtor *and* Tatianus *ought to be followed before others, according to the Computation mentioned by* Euſebius (*a*).
2. *According to the Teſtimony of theſe Authors, but eſpecially of* Caſtor, 372 *years ought to be counted betwixt* Inachus *and* Sthenelus *the Son of* Crotopus.
3. *The Kingdom of* Argos *fell after it had flouriſhed* 544 *years, till the time of* Pelops.
4. *After* Acriſius, *reigned* Sthenelus 8 *years: He was ſucceeded by* Euriſtheus, *who reigned* 43 *years. Him ſucceeded* Atreus *and* Thyeſtes, *who reigned* 65 *years; after whom reigned* Agamemnon, *whoſe Reign laſted fifteen years; and in the laſt year of his Reign* Troy *was deſtroyed by the* Greeks, *according to the Authority of the abovementioned Authors.*
5. *Upon the Computation of theſe moſt ancient Authors,* Scaliger *has founded his Calculation, who affirms that the Epocha of* Inachus *begins in the* 2857*th year of the* Julian *Period, Cyc.* ☉. 1. ☽. 7.

(*a*) Lib. 1, Chron.

6. *If*

6. *If therefore* 2856 *years be ſubtracted from any certain year of the* Julian *Period, the Reſidue ſhews the year ſince the Beginning of this Epocha; and if on the other hand the ſaid Number be added to* 2856 *years, the Product muſt be correſpondent to the year of the* Julian *Period.* To find the year ſince the beginning of this Epocha.

§. 1. WE did judge it not beyond our purpoſe to afford a peculiar Chapter for this Epocha, conſidering the Antiquity and famous Tranſactions of theſe Kings, on whoſe Hiſtory depends in a great meaſure that of the Deſtruction of *Troy*. And tho' the *Sicyonians* were alſo in former Ages in great Renown among the *Greeks*, yet if we rely upon the Authority of *Pauſanias*, the firſt contended for the Priority with all the reſt. *The Antiquity of this Epocha.*

§. 2. There are ſome who deduce the Origin of the *Argivi* out of *Ægypt*; but with the ſame Uncertainty as moſt other Nations, *Inachus* their firſt King however has been very famous in the ancient Hiſtory, as among others may appear out of theſe following Lines of (*b*) *Horace*. *The Origin of the* Argivi.

Dives ne, priſco natus ab Inacho,
Nil intereſt, an pauper & infima
De gente ſub dio moreris,
Victima nil miſerantis orci,
Omnes eodem cogimur. Omnium
Verſatur urna: ſerius, ocyus
Sors exitura, & nos in æternum
Exilium impoſitura Cymba.

§. 3. The Names and the Kings of *Argus*, and the time of their ſeveral Reigns is expreſſed in the following Table; in which we have followed the Footſteps of *Euſebius* in imitation of *Scali-* *The Names and Order of the Kings of* Argus.

(*b*) Lib. 2. Carm. Od. 3.

ger

ger and *Petavius*; unto which is added the year of the *Julian* Period, in which each of these Kings began his Reign.

Names of the Kings	*Time of their Reigns*	*Julian Period.*	*According to* Pausanias,
Inachus.	50	2857	
Phoronæus.	60	2907	Phoroneus.
Apis.	35	2967	Argus.
Argus.	70	3002	Pirasus.
Criasus,	64	3072	Phorbas.
Phorbas,	35	3126	Tropas.
Triopas,	46	3161	Jasus.
Crotopus,	21	3207	Crotopus.
Sthenelus,	11	3228	Sthenelas.
Danaus,	50	3239	Gelanor.
Lynceus,	41	3289	Danaus.
Abas,	23	3330	Lynceus.
Prœtus,	17	3353	Abas.
Acrisius,	31	3370	Acrisius,
Stheneleus,	8	3401	&c.
Euristheus,	43	3409	
Ath. & Thyestes,	65	3452	
Agamemnon,	15	3517	

Various Opinions concerning the Chronology of these Kings.

§. 4. The Ancients are much divided in their Opinion concerning the Chronology of these Kings; for *Pausanias*, *Hyginus*, and *Clemens Alexandrinus* disagree with *Eusebius*, and those other above-mentioned Authors. *Pausanias* mentions several Kings not named by *Eusebius*, and omits others, who is followed by *Hyginus* (and according to the Computation of *Clemens Alexandrinus*,) there are no more than 400 years to be computed from the beginning of this Epocha, till the time of the Destruction of *Troy*. Tho' it cannot be denied that *Pausanias* has been industrious in collecting the History of the *Gra-*

cian

cian Kings, yet considering that his Relation is not free from Fables, and incompleat the Times of the Reigns of each of these Kings, being left out, we have all the Reason in the World to prefer the Authority of *Eusebius* in this Case.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Epocha of Cecrops, *the first Founder of the Kingdom of* Athens, *and his Successors.*

1. *For want of more ancient Monuments of Antiquity concerning the Epocha of* Cecrops, *its Origin must be investigated, partly out of* Eusebius, *partly out of the* Asiatick Chronicle, *which being come to light but some years ago, is known by the Name of* Marmora Arundeliana.
2. *The time of* Cecrops *is coincident with that of* Moses, *according to* (a) Eusebius *and* Eustachius, (b) *Bishop of* Antiochia.
3. *According to* Eusebius *there are* 375 *years from the beginning of the Reign of* Cecrops *till the time of* Mnestheus.
4. *According to* Pausanias, *the same Number of years ought to be accounted from thence to the Destruction of* Troy.
5. *The Succession of these Kings ought to be regulated in such a manner as to make the Destruction of* Troy *coincident with the last times of the Reign of* Mnestheus, *the said City being taken by the* Greeks *in the* 22*d year of his Reign, according to the* Marmora Arundeliana.

(a) In Chron. (b) In Hexamer.

6. *Ac-*

6. *According to the Computation of* Clemens Alexandrinus Theſeus *reigned near fifty years before the Deſtruction of* Troy.

7. *Upon theſe and other Characters* Scaliger *has founded his Computation of the beginning of the Government of* Athens, *which at firſt being Monarchical, began in the* 3158*th year of the* Julian *Period. Cyc.* ☉. 22. ☽. 4.

To find out the year ſince the beginning of this Epocha.

8. *If therefore* 3157 *years be ſubtracted from any certain year of the* Julian *Period, the Reſidue ſhews the true year ſince the beginning of this Epocha; and if the ſame Number of* 3157 *be added to the years of the Epocha, the Product will be correſpondent to the year of the* Julian *Period.*

The ſeveral Dynaſties of the Athenians.

§. 1. THE *Athenian* Monarchy is commonly diſtinguiſhed into three ſeveral Claſſes; the firſt being of their Kings, the ſecond of their *Archontes* (or Princes) who reigned during Life; the third of their Decennial *Archontes:* a Catalogue of which may be ſeen in the following Chronological Table, according to *Scaliger* out of *Euſebius* and the Animadverſions of *Petavius.*

The

The first Dynasty of the Athenian Archontes.

Num. Reg.	*An. Reg.*	*Scal. Pe. Jul.*	*An. Reg.*	*Petav. P. Jul.*
1. Cecr. Diphyes,	50	3158	50	3156
2. Cranaus,	9	3208	9	3206
3 Amphyction,	10	3217	10	3215
4. Erychtonius,	50	3227	50	3225
5. Pandion,	40	3277	40	3275
6. Erichteus,	50	3317	50	3315
7. Cecrops II.	40	3367	40	3365
8. Pandion II.	25	3407	25	3405
9. Ægeus,	48	3432	48	3430
10. Theseus,	30	3480	30	3478
11. Mnestheus,	23	3510	23	3508
12. Demophoon	33	3533	33	3531
13. Oxynthes,	12	3	12	3564
14. Aphydas,	1	3578	1	3576
15. Thymoetes,	8	3579		3577
16. Melanthus,	37	3587	37	3585
17. Codrus,	21	3624	21	3622

The second Dynasty of the Athenian Archontes.

Num. Princip.	*An. Reg.*	*Scal. Pe. Jul.*	*An. Reg.*	*Petav. Pe. Jul.*
1. Medon,	20	3645	20	3644
2. Acaſtus,	36	3665	36	3664
3. Archippus,	19	3701	19	3700
4. Therſippus,	41	3720	41	3719
5. Phorbas,	31	3761	31	3760
6. Megacles,	30	3792	30	3791
7. Diogenetus,	28	3822	28	3821
8. Phereclus,	19	3850	19	3849
9. Ariphron,	20	3869	20	3868
10. Theſpieus.	27	3889	27	3888
11. Agameſtor,	20	3916	20	3915
12. Æſchylus,	23	3936	23	3935
13. Alcmæon,	2	3959	1	3958

The third Dynasty of the Decennial Athenian Archontes.

Num. Princip.	*An. Reg.*	*Scal. Pe. Jul.*	*An. Reg.*	*Petav. Pe. Jul.*
1. Charops,	10	3960	10	3960
2. Æſimides,	10	3970	10	3970
3. Clidicus,	10	3980	10	3980
4. Hippomenes,	10	3990	10	3990
5. Leocrates,	10	4000	10	4000
6. Apſandrus,	10	4010	10	4010
7. Eryxias,	10	4020	10	4020

§. 2.

§. 2. There is a difference of 20 years in the Chronological Computation of *Eusebius*, and that of the *Arundeliana Marmora*, concerning the beginning of this Epocha; the last putting the beginning of the Reign of *Cecrops* so many years before the other; which difference betwixt these two ancient Historians is scarce to be decided in our times. Concerning some other Difficulties in the Chronology of the *Athenian* Kings, *Petavius* (c) may be consulted. *Difference in the Chronology concerning this Epocha.*

§. 3. There are also various Opinions about the Etymology of the Word *Diphyes*, the Sirname of *Cecrops*, Some will have him to have been a Monster, as (d) *Apollodorus*; others, of a Human Shape, but a prodigious Bulk. According to (e) *Eusebius* he was called *Diphyes*, either by reason of his Tallness, or because he was born an *Ægyptian*, and understood both that and the *Greek* Tongue. *Demosthenes* says, that he was reputed to have been half a Man and half a Dragon; because he was compared for his Prudence to a Man, for his Strength to a Dragon. *The Etymology of Diphyas, and the Sirname of Cecrops.*

§. 4. After the Decennial Princes, annual Governours were introduced at *Athens*, according to (f) *Eusebius* and *Pausanias*. Nine of the principal Men of the City were elected yearly to have the Administration of the Government. He that was the Governour in chief, and in whose Name all Affairs of Moment were transacted, was called *Archon Eponymus*; the six following, *Thesmodethæ*, the eighth a *King*, the ninth, *Polemarchus*; of which *Postellus* may be consulted. *The Annual Magistrates of Athens.*

(c) In Ration. p. 112. (d) L. 3. (e) Chron. Par. prior. (f) Chron. ad Olym. 24.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

Of the Epocha of the Iſraelites *leaving of* Ægypt.

1. *The Beginning of this Epocha was at the Entrance of the* 431*ſt year of the ſojourning of th* Iſraelites *in* Ægypt, *which Interval was its firſt Origin to the Vocation of* Abraham (*a*).
2. *The ſame year was the* 480*th, to count backward from the beginning of the Epocha of* Solomon (*b*).
3. *It was likewiſe the* 46*th year before the Diſtribution of the Land of* Canaan *by Lot, which was the firſt* Sabbatic *and* Jubilean *Year* (*c*).
4. Moſes *was at the time of the* Iſraelites *going out of* Ægypt 80 *years of Age* (*d*).
5. *The Month when the* Iſraelites *went out of* Ægypt *was the firſt in the* Eccleſiaſtical *Year of the* Jews, *called* Niſan, *and began the New Moon next to the* Vernal Æquinox (*e*).
6. *The Day of their going out of* Ægypt *was on the Full Moon, the* 15*th of* Niſan, *beginning in the Evening of the Paſſover* (*f*).
7. *In the* Hebdomadic Cycle *it has for its Character the fifth* Feria; *becauſe the* 22*d Day of the Month* Jiar *was the ſeventh* Feria (*g*).
8. *According to theſe Characters it is evident that the* Jews *kept their Paſſover in the* 3217*th year of the* Julian *Period, Cyc.* ☉. 25. ☽. 6.

(*a*) Exod. 12. v. 40. (*b*) Gal. 3. v. 16, 17. (*c*) 1 Reg. 6. v. 1. (*d*) Exod. 7. v. 8. (*e*) Exod. 12. v. 2. (*f*) Numb. 33. v. 3. (*g*) Exod. 16. v. 1. ſequ.

on

on the 16th day of April, *about Sun-set, and went forth out of* Ægypt *very early the next Morning, and kept their Sabbath on the 23d day of* May, *when they collected the* Manna; *and on the 5th day of* June *the Law was promulgated in the Mount of* Sinai (*b*).

9. *If therefore* 3216 *years and* 3 *Months be subtracted from any certain Year of the* Julian *Period, the Reſidue ſhews the year ſince the beginning of the Epocha. And if this Reſidue be added to theſe* 3216 *years, the Product will be correſpondent to the year of the* Julian *Period.*

To find out the Year ſince the beginning of this Epocha.

§. 1. THere are ſome who maintain that the year of the going of the Children of *Iſrael* out of *Ægypt* has been the third in the *Sabbatic* and *Jubilean Cycle*: But (*i*) *Dorſheus* has ſufficiently demonſtrated that the true Origin of the *Sabbatic* Year is not to be looked for till 46 years after, when the *Iſraelites* being put in the Poſſeſſion of the Land of *Canaan*, diſtributed the ſame among themſelves by Lot.

When the Sabbatic Year began.

§. 2. And *Moſes* does not make an exact Mention of the time of the New Moon, next following after the *Vernal Æquinox*, in the beginning of the Month of *Niſan*; but moſt of the ancient Writers agree in this Hypotheſis with the modern Authors, that the Paſſover which was inſtituted at the time of their going out of *Ægypt*, was celebrated by the *Jews* on the 15th Day of the Month of *Niſan*, when the Moon was at the Full, as has been ſufficiently demonſtrated by (*k*) *Joſephus*; by *Philo*, (who was contemporary with Chriſt) in many Places; by (*l*) *Euſebius* in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory; and among the Moderns, by (*m*) *Beda*.

The Jews went out of Ægypt *on the 15th of* Niſan.

(*b*) Ex. 19. v. 20. (*i*) Diſſ. de Agn. Paſch. §. 4. (*k*) Lib. 3. c. 10. Antiq. (*l*) Lib. 7. c. 31. (*m*) Lib. de nat. rer. c. 61.

They celebrated the Passover at the time of the F. Moon.

§. 3. *Moses* is also silent as to the exact time of the Full Moon, when the *Jews* celebrated the Passover; but since he has been very careful in mentioning the End of the fourteenth and the beginning of the fifteenth day of the Month of *Nisan*: For the celebrating of the Passover it seems in my Opinion to include the Character of the F. Moon. Of this Opinion are (*n*) *Nicephorus Beda* and (*o*) *Philo*.

Whether they celebrated it on the 14th or 15th day of Nisan.

§. 4. There is likewise a Dispute betwixt the Chronologers, and betwixt these and the Interpreters of the Holy Scripture, whether the time of the Passover, which is the beginning of the Epocha, of the *Israelites* going out of *Ægypt*, ought to be fixed on the fourteenth or fifteenth day of the Month of *Nisan*. It is our Opinion that the Ancient *Jews* did celebrate their Passover in the Evening, at the end of the fourteenth, and the beginning of the fifteenth day of the Month of *Nisan*. 1. Because the day of their going out of *Ægypt* is mentioned to have been the fifteenth of the Month of (*p*) *Nisan*; from whence it is evident that according to the *Jewish* Institution they celebrated the Passover on the same day. 2. From the *Hebrew* Text: the Words are as follows; (*q*) *Your Lamb shall be without Blemish, of the first Year; you shall take it out from the Sheep or Goats: and you shall keep it up till the fourteenth day of the same Month; and the whole Assembly of the Congregation of* Israel *shall kill it in the Evening*. 3. From the Computation of the days of Unleavened Bread, the Words of the Institution of this Feast are these: (*r*) *And you shall observe the Feast of unleavened Bread: for in this self same day have I brought your Armies out of the Land of* Ægypt; *therefore shall you observe this day in your Generations by an Ordinance for*

(*n*) Lib. 8. Hist. (*o*) Lib. 3 de vit. Mos. (*p*) Numb. 33. v. 3. (*q*) Exod. 12. v. 5, 6. (*r*) Ex. 12. v. 17.

ever

ever. In the first Month, on the fourteenth day of the Month, at Even, you shall eat unleavened Bread, until the one and twentieth day of the Month at Even. Which Words plainly intimate, that the Feast of the Unleavened Bread ended on the one and twentieth Day of the Month of *Nisan* in the Evening, it being likewise said in the following Verse; *Seven Days shall there be no Leaven found in your House.* It is very evident from thence, that the beginning of the Days of the Unleavened Bread ought to be fixed on the End of the fourteenth Day of the Month of *Nisan*, or on the Beginning of the fifteenth, to count from Sun-set. And it is sufficiently demonstrable out of many Passages in (s) Holy Scripture, that the Feast of the Unleavened Bread, and of the Passover began on the same νυχθημερον. That which has occasioned this difference among the Chronologers is, that since that time the *Jews* have begun their Months from the New Moon; so that the same day which before was the fifteenth, was afterwards called the fourteenth day of the Month *Nisan*.

The Israelites went out of Ægypt on the 5th Feria.

§. 5. The Chronologers do disagree in their Opinions concerning the Character of the *Feria*, when the *Israelites* went out of *Ægypt*. There are many, among which are *Henricus Buntingus*, *Hieronymus Zanchius* and *Hamlinus*, who maintain this day to have been the seventh *Feria*: They alledge in their behalf the Words in *Deuteronomy*: (t) *Remember that thou wast a Servant in the Land of Ægypt; and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence, through a mighty hand and a stretched out Arm; Therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to*

(s) Exod. 12. v. 6. 17. (t) C. 5. v. 15.

keep the Sabbath Day. (*u*) *William Lange* determines the Day of their Departure out of *Ægypt* to have been the fifteenth of *Niſan*, the fifth Day of *April* according to the *Julian* Calendar, the firſt Day of the Unleavened Bread, and the ſixth *Feria*, which he pretends to prove from the Authority of the *Seder Olam Rabbah*, or the great *Hebrew Chronicle*; with whom, in ſome meaſure conſents (*x*) *Temporarius*. But the moſt general Opinion is, that the *Jews* began their Paſſover, and went out of *Ægypt* on the fifth *Feria*, to commence the Day from the Sun-ſet. Beſides, many of the Ancients, among the Modern Chronologers, (*y*) *Joſephus Scaliger*, (*z*) *Behmius* in his Chronological Manuduction, *Dorſheus*, *Frankenbergerus*, and *Calviſius* agree in this Point; becauſe it has moſt evidently appeared out of the Aſtronomical Calculations, that in the firſt year of the Departure of the *Iſraelites* out of *Ægypt*, the Paſſover which was celebrated at the Full Moon was coincident with the fifth *Feria*; and the ſame Character is correſpondent to what is related in *Exodus* in the ſixteenth Chapter: For if the two and twentieth day of the ſecond Month (called *Jiar*) was the ſeventh *Feria*, it muſt needs follow, that the fifteenth of the Month of *Niſan* was the fifth *Feria*. For betwixt the twenty ſecond Day of the Month *Jiar* and the fifteenth of *Niſan* are thirty ſeven Days; which, if divided by 7, the Reſidue is two Days; which if ſubtracted from 7, there remains 5; which demonſtrates the fifteenth Day of the Month of *Niſan* to have been the fifth *Feria*:

(*u*) Lib. 2. c. 3. de an. Chriſt. p. 263. (*x*) Lib. 1. p. 53. demonſtr. Chronol. (*y*) L. 3. Can. Iſag. p. 282. (*z*) Lib. 2. Tit. 3. Cap. 1.

That

That the 23d of the Month of *Jiar* was the ſeventh *Feria*, is evident out of the above-mentioned ſixteenth Chapter of *Exodus*, where it is ſaid, that on the fifteenth Day of the ſecond Month (*Jiar*; they came unto the Wilderneſs of *Sin*; the ſame Day they murmured againſt *Moſes*, and in the Evening the Quails came up and covered the Camp; and the next following Day being the ſixteenth, before Sunriſing they were bleſſed with the Manna for ſix Days together; to wit, the 16th, 17th, 18th, 19th, 20th, 21ſt. The laſt Day they gathered twice as much as the other Days; becauſe of the Reſt of the Sabbath of the next following Day being the 22d and the ſeventh *Feria*. But to give you a more exact Idea of ſuch Maters as have a Relation to the Chronology of this Epocha, the following Table repreſents the three firſt Months of the Year of the *Iſraelites* Departure out of *Ægypt*, and their Congruity with the *Julian* Calendar.

D. of the Mon. Nis.	Days of the Mon. of April.	The Feriæ.	
1	II	5	*The beginning of the Eccleſiaſtical*
2	III	6	*Tear*
3	IV	VII	
4	V	1	
5	VI	2	☉ *in* ♈.
6	VII	3	
7	VIII	4	
8	IX	5	
9	X	6	(Exod. 12. v. 3.
10	XI	VII	*Segregation of the Paſchal Lamb.*
11	XII	1	
12	XIII	2	
13	XIV	3	
14	XV	4	(*out of* Ægypt.
15	XVI	5	*The Paſ. Firſt-born ſlain. Departure*
16	XVII	6	*They pitch their Tents in* Etham.
17	XVIII	VII	*They pitch in* Pihahiroth.
18	XIX	1	*They paſs through the* Red Sea.
19	XX	2	
20	XXI	3	*They pitch in* Marah.
21	XXII	4	
22	XXIII	5	
23	XXIV	6	
24	XXV	VII	
25	XXVI	1	
26	XXVII	2	
27	XXVIII	3	
28	XXIX	4	
29	XXX	5	
30	I *of May*	6	

D. of

D. of the Mon. Jiar.	Days of the Mon. of May.	The Feriæ.	
1	II	VII	
2	III	1	
3	IV	2	
4	V	3	
5	VI	4	
6	VII	5	
7	VIII	6	
8	IX	VII	
9	X	1	
10	XI	2	
11	XII	3	
12	XIII	4	
13	XIV	5	
14	XV	6	
15	XVI	VII	*They come to the Wilderneſs of Sin.*
16	XVII	1	*The Gathering of* Manna.
17	XVIII	2	
18	XIX	3	
19	XX	4	
20	XXI	5	
21	XXII	6	
22	XXIII	VII	*No* Manna *by reaſon of the Sabbath.*
23	XXIV	1	*They come in* Raphidim.
24	XXV	2	
25	XXVI	3	Moſes *ſtrikes Water out of the Rock.*
26	XXVII	4	*The* Jews *vanquiſh the* Amalekites.
27	XXVIII	5	Jethro *comes to* Moſes.
28	XXIX	6	*Election of the LXX Elders.*
29	XXX	VII	

D. of the Mon. Siv.	Days of the Mon. of June.	The Feriæ.	
1	XXXI	1	*They come into the Wildern. of* Sinai,
2	I June.	2	Exod. 19. v. 1.
3	II	3	
4	III	4	
5	IV	5	
6	V	6	
7	VI	VII	*Beginning of the* 40 *days* Moses *staid*
8	VII	1	*upon the Mount, the End of which*
9	VIII	2	*falls in the Month of* Tamuz,
10	IX	3	*which is observed as a Fast-day by*
11	X	4	*the* Jews *to this day.*
12	XI	5	
13	XII	6	
14	XIII	VII	
15	XIV	1	
16	XV	2	
17	XVI	3	
18	XVII	4	
19	XVIII	5	
20	XIX	6	
21	XX	VII	
22	XXI	1	
23	XXII	2	
24	XXIII	3	
25	XXIV	4	
26	XXV	5	
27	XXVI	6	
28	XXVII	VII	
29	XXVIII	1	
30	XXIX	2	

§. 6.

§. 6. The Words in (*a*) *Exodus*, and the whole Assembly of the Congregation of *Israel* shall kill it betwixt the two Evenings, have met with various Interpretations. *Aben Ezra* understands by it the Interval betwixt Sun-set and the Beginning of the Night; of which Opinion is also *Rabbi David Kimchi*: But since, according to (*b*) *Josephus*, at the Feast of one Passover there were slain 255600 Lambs, we also agree with the same Author in Opinion, who asserts that the *Jews* used to begin at nine a-clock (about three in the Afternoon with us) to kill these Beasts, and leave off again at eleven (about five with us.) *Of the time when they killed the Lamb for the Passover.*

CHAP. X.

Of the two Epocha's of the Division of the Land of Canaan *among the Tribes of* Israel, *and of their first beginning to cultivate the Ground.*

1. *They first began from that time after they* Israelites *had passed the River of* Jordan, *and made themselves Masters of the Land of* Canaan (*a*).
2. *At which time all the Tribes had their particular inheritance assigned them* (*b*).
3. *The year of this Distribution was the 45th after the second, from the time of their going out of* Ægypt, *as is evident from the Words of* (*c*) Caleb: Forty Years was I when *Moses* the Servant of the Lord sent me from *Kadesh-Barnea* to espy out the Land; and I brought

(*a*) Cap. 12. v. 6. (*b*) L. 7. c. 17. de Bel. Judaic. (*a*) Numb. 33. v. 51. seq. (*b*) Numb. 34. v 1. seq. (*c*) Jos. 14. 7. 16

him

him word again as it was in mine Heart. And now behold the Lord hath kept me alive as he ſaid, the 45 years, ever ſince the Lord ſpake this Word unto *Moſes*, while the Children of *Iſrael* wandred in the Wilderneſs; and now I am this day eighty five years old (*d*).

4. *The year of the Diſtribution of the Land was the laſt Sabbatick Year in the* Proleptick Cycle; *and the following was the firſt in the* Sabbatick Cycle, *according to God's Inſtitution.* (*e*) When you come into the Land which I give you, then ſhall the Land keep a Sabbath (*Reſt*) unto the Lord; Six years thou ſhalt ſow thy Field, and ſix years thou ſhalt prune thy Vineyard, and gather in the Fruit thereof: But in the ſeventh year ſhall be a Sabbath of Reſt unto the Land, a Sabbath for the Lord; thou ſhalt neither ſow thy Field, neither prune thy Vineyard (*f*).

5. *From theſe Characters we conclude, that the year of the Diviſion of the Land was coincident with the* 3261*ſt year of the* Julian *Period, Cycl.* ☉. 15. ☽. 14. *And that the firſt year of cultivating the Ground began in the Month* Tiſri, *or firſt Autumnal Month of the ſame year of the* Julian *Period.*

Any year given of the Julian *Period to inveſtigate the year ſince the beginning of this Epocha.*

6. *If therefore* 3261 *years and* 9 *Months be ſubtracted from any certain year of the* Julian *Period, the Reſidue ſhews the Year ſince the beginning of the Epocha of the Diviſion of the Land of* Canaan; *and if* 3262 *Years and* 9 *Months be ſubtracted from the ſame year of the* Julian *Period, the Reſidue ſhews, that ſince the beginning of the Epocha of the cultivating of the Land. And if theſe ſeveral* 3261 *and* 3262 *years be added to the years of the before-named*

(*d*) Vid. Num. 1. and 13. (*e*) Lev. 25. v. 2. (*f*) Vid. Ex. 23. v. 10, 11. and Deut. 15. v. 1, & c. 31. v. 9.

E-

Epocha's, the Product will be correspondent to the year of the Julian *Period.*

§. 1. (g) *Dionysius Petavius* in Opposition to *Scaliger*, maintains, that from the Words of *Caleb* no exact Computation can be made as to the year of the cultivating of the Land, it being dubious whether the same ought to be accounted from the Beginning or End of the forty sixth year after the Departure of the *Israelites* out of *Ægypt*; But besides, that the Perspicuity of the Words of *Caleb* is an undeniable Argument against *Petavius*, it is evident that the year of the Distribution of the Land was a *Sabbatick* Year; and that of the cultivating of the Land the first of both the *Sabbatick* and *Jubilean* Cycles.

Whether the beginning of the Sabbatick Year may be gathered from the Words of Caleb.

§. 2. (h) *Laurentius Codomannus*, (i) *Johannes Temporarius*, in his Chronological Demonstrations, *Jacobus Capellus*, and several other modern Chronologers, are of Opinion that the first year of the cultivating of the Land was the fortieth after the Departure of the *Israelites* out of *Ægypt*; at which time *Joshua* being declared Successor to *Moses*, they passed *Jordan*, and the *Manna* ceased. But it seems very improbable to me, that the *Jews* should immediately after their passing that River, have begun to cultivate the Ground before they were in possession of any considerable part of it; and that in a fertile Country, where, without question, they found the Cities and Country stored with all manner of Necessaries for their Sustenance.

Different Opinions concerning the Epocha of cultivating the Ground.

§. 3. In *Seder Olam*, or the *Hebrew* Chronicle, published by *Genebrardus*, which is of great Authority among the *Jews*, the Author pretends to evince, that the Division of the Land was not made till seven years after the six and fortieth

The Opinion of the Jews concerning it.

(g) L. 9. c. 25. de doct. temp (h) L. 2. Chron. (i) L. 3.

year

year after the going out of *Ægypt*; but they are mere *Jewish* Trifles, not deserving a Place here, as may be seen in (*k*) *Serrarius*.

CHAP. XI.

Of the Epocha of the Destruction of TROY.

1. *This Epocha being much involved in Fables and Poetical Fictions, the same must be carefully distinguished from the true Historical Relations; so that not all that has been left us by Antiquity of the Destruction of* Troy, *ought to be looked upon as fabulous; neither the true History be commaculated with the Fictions of the Poets.*
2. *Care ought to be taken that the time of the Destruction of* Troy *be not confounded with that of the beginning of the War, it being evident out of* (*a*) Virgil *that it was not taken till after a War of ten years.*

——— captiq; dolis, lachrymisq; coactis,
Quos nec Tydides, nec Lariſſæus Achilles,
Non anni domuere decem, non mille carinæ.

The whole War lasted ten Years, six Months and twelve Days.

3. *According to the Testimony of* Timæus *in* Censorinus *from the first Olympiad, which began in Summer, to account backwards to the Time of the beginning of the* Trojan *War, are* 417 *years.*
4. *From the Destruction of* Troy *to the first Olympiad, are* 408 *years.* From the *Trojan*

(*k*) In Jos c. 13. quæst. 14. (*a*) L. 2. Æneid.

War,

War, *says* (*b*) Diodorus Siculus, to the time of the Return of the *Heraclides*, I compute 80 years, from thence to the first Olympiad, 328 years.

5. *Soon after the Destruction of* Troy, Æneas *with some of his Countrymen arrived in* Italy; *from whom the People of* Rome *had their first Offspring, according to St.* (*c*) Austin. It ought not to be pass'd by in Silence here, *says* Solin*, that Æneas in the second year after the Destruction of *Troy* came into *Italy* with 600 of his Countrymen, and pitched his Tents near *Laurentum*.

6. *The* Arcades, Pelasgi, Epeans *and* Eleans, *as also the* Trojans, *were those Nations that laid the first Foundation of* Rome, *in the* 402*d year after the Destruction of* Troy, *in the* 7*th Olympiad, according to* (*d*) Dionysius Halicarnassæus *and* Velleius Paterculus.

7. *The* Trojan *War and the Destruction of that City happned under the Reigns of* Priamus *King of* Troy *and of* Menelaus *King of* Lacedæmon; *the first had a Son called* Alexander (*otherwise* Paris) *who carried away* Helen *from her Brother* Agamemnon.

8. *The Destruction of* Troy *happned in the last year of the Reign of* Agamemnon, *according to* (*e*) Eusebius.

9. Mnestheus *King of* Athens *was present in the* Trojan *War, according to* (*f*) Clemens Alexandrinus.

10. *From the Nativity of* Moses *till the Destruction of* Troy, *are near* 400 *years, as* (*g*) Eusebius *has computed it.*

11. *From the Destruction of* Troy *to the End of the* Peloponnesian *War, when the* Athenians *ob-*

(*b*) L. 1. Bib. (*c*) L. 3. c. 2. de Civ. Dei. *c. 8. (*d*) Rom. An. L. 2. (*e*) L. 2. Chr. 11. (*f*) L. 1. Strom. (*g*) L. 10. de præp. Evang. Cap. 9.

tained

tained the Principality in Greece, *are according to the Computation of* (*i*) Diodorus Siculus 779 *years.*

12. *From the Deſtruction of* Troy *till the year which preceded the beginning of the Reign of* Agathocles *the Tyrant, are computed* 866 *years, But* Agathocles *began to reign at* Syracuſa *when* Demogenes *was* Archon (*or Prince*) *of* Athens, *and* L. Photius *and* M. Toſtius *Conſuls of* Rome (*k*).

13. *From the Deſtruction of* Troy, *till the time of* Lactantius, *who writ in the year* 287 *after the Birth of Chriſt are* 1470 *years according to* (*l*) Lactantius *himſelf.*

14. *All the Ancients agree in Opinion, that the Deſtruction of* Troy *hapned in the beginning of the Summer Quarter, as among others, is evident out of* (*m*) Virgil.

Poſtquam res Aſiæ, Priamique evertere gentem
Immeritam viſam ſuperis, ceciditq; ſuperbum
Ilium, & omnis humo fumat Neptunia Troja:
Diverſa exilia, & deſertas quærere terras,
Auguriis agimur divûm: claſſemq; ſub ipſa
Antandro & Phrygiæ molimur montibus Idæ,
Incerti quo fata ferant, ubi ſiſtere detur:
Contrahimuſque viros. VIX PRIMA INCEPERAT ÆSTAS,
Et Pater Anchiſes dare fatis vela jubebat.

15. *The Month of* Thargelion *was always accounted unfortunate among the Barbarians; becauſe on the four and twentieth day of this Month* Troy *was believed to have been taken, accord-*

(*i*) Lib. 14 (*k*) Diod. Sic. Bibl. l. 19. (*l*) L. 1. de falſ. Relig. (*m*) L. 3. Æneid.

ing

ing to Ephorus, Callisthenes, Damasthes, Philarchus *and* Plutarch *in the Life of* Camillus.

16. *The time of the Day when the victorious* Greeks *entred the City of* Troy, *is indigitated by* (*n*) Virgil.

Vertitur interea cœlum & ruit Oceano nox,
Involvens umbra magna terramque populumque,
Myrmidonumque dolos. Fusi per mœnia Teucri
Conticuere: Sopor fessos complectitur artus.
Et jam Argiva phalanx instructis navibus ibat.
A Tenedo, tacitæ per amica silentia Lunæ,
Littora nota petens.

And soon after,

Invadunt urbem somno, vinoque sepultam.

17. *From what has been alledged upon the Authority of the best Historians, it may probably be inferr'd, that the Destruction of* Troy *happned in the* 3530*th year of the* Julian *Period, Cyc.* ☉. 2. ☽. 15. *in the Night betwixt the* 11*th and* 12*th day of* June.

18. *If therefore* 3529 *years and five Months be subtracted from any certain year of the* Julian *Period, the Residue shews the year since the beginning of this Epocha; and if the said* 3529 *years be added to the year of the said Epocha, the Product must be correspondent to the year of the* Julian *Period.*

To find out the year since the beginning of this Epocha.

(*n*) Lib. 2. Æn.

Whether the Deſtruction of Troy be only a Fable.

§. 1. HOW famous ſoever the Deſtruction of *Troy* is, both among the *Greek* and *Latin* Hiſtorians, yet there are ſome who either call the whole or the greateſt part of what the Ancients have left us, concerning it, in queſtion: Among the firſt of thoſe was *Dio Chryſoſtomus*, who relying upon the Authority of a certain *Ægyptian* Prieſt, relates, that it appeared out of the Ancient *Ægyptian* Monuments, that *Helen* had been the Daughter of *Tyndareus* King of *Sparta*, and was married to *Alexander* the Son of *Priamus*, King of *Troy*. That the *Greeks* out of a Motive of Jealouſie of the Greatneſs and Power of *Troy*, had entred into a Confederacy againſt *Priamus*; but with very ill Succeſs, the *Trojans* having gotten the better of the *Greeks* in ſeveral Engagements, in one of which *Achilles* was ſlain by *Hector*. One *Metrodorus* of *Lampſacus*, introduced by *Tatianus*, denies that there were ever ſuch Perſons living as *Hector*, *Achilles*, *Agamemnon*, *Helen* and *Paris*; and that theſe Names had been only invented by the Poets to adorn their Fictions. (o) *Philippus Cluverius* does not abſolutely contradict the Deſtruction of *Troy*; but ſpeaks much in Commendation of *Dio*; and abſolutely rejects the Relation of *Æneas* coming into *Italy*. But tho' it be undeniable that the *Greeks* have not been the moſt exact in their Annals, which have been much adulterated by the fabulous Relations of their Poets; yet this cannot be alledged as a ſufficient Reaſon for the rejecting ſo conſiderable a part of Hiſtory, confirmed by the Authority not only of the *Greeks* but of the *Latins*, and moſt other Nations. It is unqueſtionable that the Ruines of *Troy* are undeniable Arguments of its former Greatneſs, which our Adverſaries, to ſave themſelves, pretend to have been deſtroy-

(o) Ital. Ant. Lib. 3.

ed

ed by Earthquakes and Inundations. But it appears to me unreasonable to call to our Aid the Elements to maintain the Authority of a Foreign *Ægyptian* Priest, in Opposition to what has been asserted for Truth by so many *Greek* and other Historians.

§. 2. Those that contradict the Destruction of *Troy*, allege also in their behalf, that *Homer* was both the first Poet and Author among the *Greeks*. It is true, that all the *Greek* Historians, whose Names have been transmitted to Posterity, have lived some Ages after the *Trojan* War; yet is it not from thence to be inferred, that *Homer* was either the first or the only Author who has given an Account of the Expedition of the *Greeks* against the *Trojans*. "A certain Poet, says (*p*) *Ælian*, "whose Name was *Syagrus*, lived after *Orpheus*, "who first of all brought the *Trojan* War into Me"tre. And what *Ovid* says of *Macro* is a sufficient Argument that there were not wanting among the *Latins* who endeavoured to supply the Defects of *Homer* in the *Trojan* War. These are his Words: *Some Arguments for and against the Destruction of Troy.*

Tu canis æterno quicquid restabat Homero,
Ne careant summa Troica bella manu.

§. 3. As there are some who reject the whole History of *Troy* as fabulous, so there are not wanting such as put *Homer* in the same Rank with other Historians. Both are, in my Opinion in an Error, as is manifest out of what is related concerning the wooden Horse; which, though it be not only circumstantially described by *Homer* and *Virgil*, but also was used in a Proverbial Sense among the *Roman* Orators, as is manifest from these Words of *Tully*: *Out of the School of* Isocrates, *like out of the* Trojan *Horse, came forth a vast* *Concerning the Authority of Homer.*

(*p*) Lib. 14. c. 21. var. Hist.

Number of great Men: Yet (q) *Pausanias* himself is very plain in telling the World that this Horse was nothing else but a certain Engine invented by one *Epeus* (a Pattern of which stood in the Castle of *Athens*) to batter the Walls of strong Cities: And he adds, that those who believe otherwise, must needs look upon the *Trojans* to have been the greatest Fools and Blockheads in the World. Neither does (r) *Virgil* seem to have been quite ignorant of it, when he introduces *Laocoon* speaking these following Words:

Aut hoc inclusi ligno occultantur Achivi,
Aut hæc in nostros fabricata est machina muros,
Inspectura domos, venturaque desuper urbi.

Troy was a whole Kingdom.

§. 4. Some are of Opinion that the Destruction of *Troy* was comprehended only in one City; But according to (s) *Strabo*, the Country under the Jurisdiction of the *Trojan* Kings consisting in nine large Principalities, was called *Troja*; which being invaded and conquered by the *Greeks*, they at last made themselves Masters of *Troy*, the Capital City, which has, questionless, introduced this Mistake of converting this War, which lasted in all ten years, into a Decennial Siege.

The Destruction of Troy was much celebrated among the Ancients.

§. 5. This Epocha was so famous in most ancient time, that if we believe (t) *Diodorus Siculus*, this was the first Term unto which the *Greek* Historians related their most ancient and remarkable Transactions. And what has rendred this Epocha the more famous to Antiquity, is, that the Conquest of *Troy* was bought with the Loss of so many brave and great Heroes; from whence is arisen the Proverb Ἰλιὰς κακῶν, thus expressed by *Catullus*:

(q) In At. (r) L. 2. Æn. (s) L. 13. (t) Præfat. L. 1.

Troja nefas, commune Jepulchrum Europæ Asiæq;
Troja virûm & virtutum omnium acerba cinis.

§. 6. The Chronologers disagree also as to the true time of this Epocha: for besides the various Opinions alledged by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Porphyrius* has made the Destruction of *Troy* coincident with the Reign of *Semiramis*; as on the contrary, (*u*) *Johannes Georgius Herwart ab Hohenburgh* has put no more than seven Ages betwixt the Destruction of *Troy* and the Epocha of Christ. But, to set aside these extravagant Notions, there are three several Opinions more, which carry with them the greatest Probability. The first fixes the taking of *Troy* in the 3530th year of the *Julian* Period; which is also our Opinion (for Reasons alledged in the beginning of this Chapter), as well as of *Dionysius Petavius* and *Jacobus Capellus*. The second is of *Josephus Scaliger* with his Followers *Calvisius* and *Emmius*, who affirm that *Troy* was destroyed in the year 3531 of the *Julian* Period, on the 22d of *June*, in the year of the World 2767. The Third Opinion is of *Buntingus*, who maintains that the Destruction of *Troy* hapned in the year of the World 2787, in the year of the *Julian* Period 3532, on the 21st of *June*.

Different Opinions concerning this Epocha.

§. 7. As the greatest part of the *Trojan* History is involved in great Obscurity; so its time remains as yet undetermined, we being ignorant how long *Teucrus* reigned over that Kingdom. Out of the following Table it will appear that from the time of *Dardanus*, Son-in-law to *Teucrus*, till the Destruction of *Troy* under *Priamus*, there was a continual Succession, from Father to Son, of six Kings for 296 years.

Kings of Troy

(*u*) In Chron. Cap. 34.

	Years.	An. Pe. Jul.
1. King *Teucrus*,----		
2. *Dardanus*, his Son-in-law,	65	3234
3. *Erichtonius*, his Son,	46	3299
4. *Tros*, his Son,	49	3345
5. *Ilus*, his Son,	40	3394
6. *Laomedon*, his Son,	44	3434
7. *Priamus*, his Son,	52	3478
From *Dardanus* to the Deſtruction of *Troy*,	296	3530

The firſt Founder of Troy.

§. 8. There is alſo a great Diſpute who was the Founder of the City of *Troy* or *Ilium*. The common Opinion is, that *Ilus* the Son of *Tros* was the Founder of this City, according to which Suppoſition *Troy* has not ſtood an Age and an half. Of this Opinion is (*x*) *Strabo* and *Conon* in *Photius*. *Reinerus Reineccius*, with ſome others, attribute it to *Tros*. Others go back as far as to King *Dardanus*, to whom they give the Honour of having laid the firſt Foundation of *Ilium* or *Troy*; with whom conſents (*y*) *Virgil* when he ſays thus:

Dardanus, Iliacæ primus pater urbis & auctor
Electrâ ut (Graji perhibent) Atlantide cretus,
Advehitur Teucros, &c.

(*x*) L. 13. Geor. de Regn. Troj. p. 174. (*y*) L. 3. Æn.

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

Of the Epocha of the Reign of David *and his Succeſſors in both Kingdoms of* Judah *and* Iſrael.

1. *The beginning of the Reign of* David *is coincident with the* 30*th year of his Age* (*a*).
2. *The firſt year of this Epocha precedes the Death of* David 40 *years* (*b*).
3. *The* 44*th year of this Epocha, or the fourth of the Reign of* Solomon *is coincident with the* 480*th year after the going of the Children of* Iſrael *out of* Ægypt (*c*).
4. *The ſame* 44*th year is the year of the building of the Temple of* Solomon (*d*).
5. *The* 81*ſt year of this Epocha is the firſt of the Reign of* Jeroboam, *and of the* 390 *years of the Iniquity of the Houſe of* Iſrael; *becauſe* Solomon *and his Father reigned each* 40 *years* (*e*).
6. *The Reigns of the Succeſſors of* David *in both Kingdoms ought to be regulated according to the true Synchroniſm of the ſacred Writ, the years of their Reigns being involved in no ſmall Difficulties. From whence it is apparent that the firſt year of* David's *Reign is coincident with the* 3654*th year of the* Julian *Period, Cycl.* ☉. 14. ☽. 6.
7. *If therefore the* 3653 *years be ſubtracted from any certain year of the* Julian *Period, the Reſidue ſhews the year ſince the beginning of this Epocha; and if* 3653 *be added to the Number of years* *To inveſtigate the Year ſince the beginning of the Epocha.*

(*a*) 2 Sam. 5. v. 4. 3. (*b*) Ibid. Chron. 3. v. 4. c. 30. v. 27.
(*c*) 1 Reg. 6. v. 1. (*d*) 1 Reg. 6. v. 1. (*e*) Ezec. 4. v. 5.

years of this Epocha, the Product is the year of the Julian *Period.*

Difficulties concerning the Nativity of David.

§. 1. THE Interval betwixt the 3260th year of the *Julian* Period when the *Jews* first conquered *Paleſtine*, and the 3624th year of the *Julian* Period when *David* was born, being of above 360 years, and to be divided betwixt *Salmon*, *Boatz*, *Obed* and *Jeſſe*, involves the Nativity of *David* in no ſmall Difficulty. For the Genealogy of the Anceſtors of *David*, is thus repreſented (*f*): *And* Naſhon *begot* Salmon, *and* Salmon *begot* Booz, *and* Booz *begot* Obed, *and* Obed *begot* Jeſſe, *and* Jeſſe *begot* David. So that every one of theſe muſt be ſuppoſed to have begot Children when they were near 100 years old; it being evident that *Naſhon* entred *Paleſtine* with *Joſhua*. (*g*) *Lyra*, *Salianus*, *Genebrardus*, *Catharinus*, *Janſenius*, *Eſthius*, and their Proſelytes, to remove this Difficulty, have ſubſtituted two more of the ſame Name with *Boaz*, but in vain, ſince the ſame Genealogy is repeated in three ſeveral other Places, to wit, 1 *Chron.* 2. v. 11, 12. in St. *Matth.* 1. v. 4. in St. *Luke* 3. v. 32. Our Opinion is, that without having Recourſe to theſe Tergiverſations, it may rationally be ſuppoſed, that the Anceſtors of *David* begot Children in their old Age, as it is evident in *Boatz* out of the Book of *Ruth* (*h*), and in *Obed* out of 1 *Sam.* 17. v. 12.

Difficulties concerning the Kings of Judah *&* Iſrael.

§. 2. There being a ſeeming Contradiction in the Chronological Computation of theſe Kings in the *Hebrew* Text, *Dionyſius Petavius*, *Alſtedius*, *Torniellus*, *Buntingus*, and ſeveral others believe the ſame to have been adulterated. But this be-

(*f*) Ruth 4. v. 20. ſeq. (*g*) Numb. 1. v. 7. & 2. v. 3. c. 7. v. 12. (*h*) C. 3. v. 10.

ing

ing the way to diſſect, but not to diſſolve the Knot, it will be more convenient to find out ſome other way to reconcile theſe Differences. It is therefore obſervable, that in this Chronology ſometimes the incompleat years are taken for compleat ones: as for Inſtance, when *Jeroboam* is ſaid to have reigned 22 years, is to be underſtood of 21 compleat years, at the beginning of the 22d. Thus it is alſo to be taken with the 24 years attributed to (*k*) *Baaſha* inſtead of 23; with the 12 years of (*l*) *Amri* inſtead of 11, &c. In other Places, inſtead of the incompleat years expreſſed, the compleat ones ought to be underſtood. As for Inſtance, when it is ſaid that (*m*) *Aſa* began his Reign in the 20th year of the Reign of (*i*) *Jeroboam*, is to be taken in this ſenſe; that he began his Reign at the beginning of the 21ſt year of *Jeroboam*. In ſome Paſſages it appears that ſeveral, but eſpecially Father and Son reigned at the ſame time: ſo it is ſaid of (*n*) *Nadab*, that he reigned in the firſt year together with his Father *Jeroboam*: Of (*o*) *Ela*, that he reigned at the ſame time with his Father *Baaſha*. The ſame is ſaid of (*p*) *Ahaziah* and *Ahab*; of *Jehoſhaphat* and *Jehoram*, 2 Reg. 3. v. 1. Of this there is an evident Example in (*q*) *Amri*, who is ſaid to have reigned 12 years; to wit, including the time that *Thibni* aſſumed the Royal Dignity. It is further obſervable, that in the Chronology of theſe Kings the Computation begins not always from the beginning of their Reigns, but from ſome remarkable Epocha or Revolution: As, it is ſaid that (*r*) *Baaſha* came up againſt *Ramah* in the 36th year of the Reign of *Aſa*, when it is evident that he died

(*i*) 1 Reg. 14. v. 20. (*k*) 1 Reg. 15. v. 33. (*l*) 1 Reg. 16. v. 23. (*m*) 1 Reg. 15. v. 9. (*n*) 1 Reg. 15. v. 25. (*o*) 1 Reg. 16. v. 8. (*p*) 1 Reg. 22. v. 52. (*q*) 1 Reg. 16. v. 21. (*r*) 2 Chron. 16 v. 1.

in the six and twentieth year of the Reign of *Asa* (*t*) some interpret thus; that here is to be understood the 36th year since the Division of the Kingdom after *Solomon*'s Death; as if it had been expressed thus: *In the thirty sixth year after the Division of the Kingdom, of which* Asa *was King.* There are also some Footsteps of certain Vacancies of the Throne betwixt *Amaziah* and *Azariah* the Kings of *Judah*, and betwixt *Jeroboam* and *Zacharias* Kings of *Israel*. All which we leave to the Choice and Decision of the judicious Reader.

How to reconcile these Differences.

§. 3. There is no better way to reconcile the Chronological Differences about the Kings of *Judah* and *Israel*, than by making a due Comparison betwixt the Synchronisms and Combinations of Years of the several Kings of both these Kingdoms. The following two Tables exhibit at the same instant the Mutual Connection of the Reigns of these Kings, according to the Tenure of the Sacred Scriptures: But because the Years of their Reigns are not always correspondent to this Connection, I have added those other Years, which, by reason of their Usefulness in reconciling these Differences, I have called the Chronological Years.

(*t*) 1 Reg. v. 6. 8.

An.

An. P.J.	Succession of the Kings of Judah.		Succession of the Kings of Israel.		Scrip. Years of the Kings of Jud.	Scrip. Years of the Kings of Israel.
3654	1	David			40	
3694	1	Solomon			40	
3734	1	Rehoboam	1	Jeroboam	17	22
3751	1	Abijam	18		3	
3753	1	Asa	20		41	
3754	2		1	Nadab		2
3755	3		1	Baasha		24
3778	26		1	Ela		2
3779	27		1	Simri		
3783	31		1	Amri		
3790	38		1	Ahab		12
3793	1	Jehoshaph.	4		25	22
3809	17		1	Ahaziah		2
3810	18		1	Jehoram		12
3814	1	Jehoram	5		8	
3821	1	Ahaziah	12		1	
3822	1	Athaliah	1	Jehu	6	8
3828	1	Jehoash	7		40	
3850	23		1	Jehoahaz		17
3864	37		1	Joash		16
3865	1	Amaziah	2		29	
3879	15		1	Jerob. II		41
3905	1	Azariah	27			
3942	38		1	Zacharias	52	6 m.
3943	39		1	Shallum		1 m.
3943	39		1	Menahem		10
3954	50		1	Pekajah		2
3956	52		1	Pekah		20

Chron. Years of the Kings of		Places of Scripture.
Jud.	Israel	
40		2 Sam. V. 4. 1 Chron. III. 4. c.
40	20	1 Reg. XI. 42. (30. v. 27.
17		1 Reg. XIV. 21.
3		1 Reg. XV. 1. 2 Chr. XIII. 1.
40		1 Reg. XV. 9.
	1	1 Reg. XV. 25.
	23	1 Reg. XV. 33.
	1	1 Reg. XVI. 8.
		1 Reg. XVI. 15, 16.
	11	1 Reg. XVI. 23.
	19	1 Reg. XVI. 29.
		1 Reg. XXII. 41, 42.
	1	1 Reg. XXII. 52.
	12	2 Reg. III 1.
7		2 Reg. VIII. 16.
1		2 Reg. VIII. 25.
6	28	2 Reg. XI. 1, 2, 3. c. ix. 12.
35		2 Reg. XII. 1.
	14	2 Reg. XIII. 1.
	15	2 Reg. XIII. 10.
40		2 Reg. XIV. 1.
	63	2 Reg. XIV. 23.
52		2 Reg. XV. 1.
	1	2 Reg. XV. 8.
	0	2 Reg. XV. 13.
	11	2 Reg. XV. 17.
	2	2 Reg. XV. 23.
	28	2 Reg. XV. 27.

An.

An. P.J.	Succession of the Kings of Judah.	Succession of the Kings of Israel.	Scrip. Years of the Kings of Jud.	Scrip. Years of the Kings of Israel.
3958	1 Jothram	2	16	
3973	1 Ahaz	17	16	
3984	12	1 Hosea		9
3986	1 Hezekiah	3	29	
399	6	Finis.		
4015	1 Manasseh		55	
4070	1 Ammon		2	
4072	1 Josiah		31	
4103	1 Jehoahaz		55	
4103	1 Jehojakim		2	
4106	4	1 Nebuchad.	31	
4114	1 Jehoiachim	8 Nebuchad.	3m.	
4114	1 Zedekiah		11	
4124	11	19 Nebuch.		

An.

Chron. Years of the Kings of		Places of Scripture.
Jud.	Israel.	
15		2 Reg. XV. 32.
13		2 Reg. XVI. 1.
	7	2 Reg. XVII. 1.
29		2 Reg. XVIII. 1.
		2 Reg. XVIII. 10. 11.
55		2 Reg. XXI. 1.
2		2 Reg. XXI. 19.
13		2 Reg. XXII. 1.
0		2 Reg. XXIII. 31.
10		2 Reg. XXIII. 36. Jer. XXV. 1.
0		2 Reg. XXIV. 12, 8.
10		2 Reg. XXV. 18.
		2 Reg. XXV. 38. Jer. LII. 12. 29.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIII.

Of the Epocha of the Temple of SOLOMON.

1. *The exact time of the building of the Temple of* Solomon *muſt be determined according to the Sacred Hiſtory, where we read theſe following Words:* (*a*) And it came to paſs in the four hundred and fourſcore year after the Children were come out of the Land of *Ægypt*, in the fourth year of *Solomon's* Reign over *Iſrael*, in the Month *Zif*, which is the ſecond Month, that he began to build the Houſe of the Lord.

2. *The Interval betwixt the going out of the* Iſraelites *out of* Ægypt, *and the time of* David (*on which depends the Computations of the Epocha of the Temple, being the fourth year of the Reign of* Solomon) *ought to be regulated according to the Genealogy of* David, *deſcribed in* Ruth 4.20. *ſeq.* 1 Chron. 11. 11. Matth. 1. 5. *where it is to be obſerved, that* Naſhon, *who lived and died whilſt the* Iſraelites *were in the Deſart,* (*b*) begot *Salmon*, *Salmon* begot *Boatz*, and *Boatz* begot *Obed*, *Obed* begot *Jeſſe*, and *Jeſſe David*.

3. *This Interval ought alſo to be regulated in ſuch a manner as not to be contradictory to the Words of* (*c*) Jephtha; Whilſt *Iſrael* dwelled in *Heſhbon* and her Towns, and in *Aroer* and her Towns, and in all the Cities that be along by the Coaſts of *Arnon* three hundred years; why therefore did you not recover them within that time?

(*a*) 1 Reg. 6. v. 1. 10. (*b*) Numb. 1. v. 7. c. 7. v. 12. (*c*) Judg. 11. v. 26.

Which

Which Computation of Jephtha, *according to the Hypotheſis of the time of Servitude, and of the Government of the* Jews *under the Judges to be accounted by its ſelf is abſolutely falſe.*

4. *Betwixt the fourth year of the Reign of* Solomon, *the firſt of the Epocha of the Temple, till the firſt year of the Iniquity of* Iſrael, *of which mention is made in* Ezek. 4. 5. *are computed* 37 *years; becauſe* (*d*) Solomon *reigned* 40 *years; and the general Defection of* Iſrael *happned under* (*e*) Jeroboam, *the firſt year after* Solomon's *Death.*

5. *The firſt Temple was built by* (*f*) Solomon *in ſeven years:* And in the eleventh year, in the Month *Bul* (which is the eighth Month) was the Houſe finiſhed throughout all the Parts thereof, and according to all the Faſhion of it: So was he ſeven years in building of it.

6. *From the time of the Foundation of the Temple of* Solomon *till its Deſtruction, which happned in the year of the* Julian *Period* 4124, *and* 8 *Months, are* 427 *Years and* 6 *Months; which Interval is calculated from the fourth year of the Reign of* Solomon *till the laſt year of* Zedekiah, *out of the Books of the* Kings *and* Chronicles; *in which Opinion agree with us, not only moſt of the* Jewiſh *Interpreters, but alſo among the modern Chronologers,* Joſepus Scaliger, Henricus Buntingus, Sethus Calviſius, Michael Mœſtlinus, Henricus Philippi, Jacobus Hainlinus, *and many more.*

7. *From theſe Characters may be collected the beginning of this Epocha, according to which* Solomon *laid the firſt Foundation of the Temple in the year of the* Julian *Period* 3697, *in the Month of* May, *Cycl.* ☉. 12. ☽. 2. *and compleated the whole Structure in the* 3704*th year of the*

(*d*) 2 Chron. 9. v. 10. (*e*) 1 Reg. 12. v. 26. (*f*) 1 Reg. 6. v. 38.

Julian

Julian *Period*, *Cycl.* ☉. 8. ☽. 18. *in the Month of* October.

Any certain year given of the Jul. *Period to find the year since the beginning of this Epocha.*

§. *If therefore* 3696 *years and* 4 *Months be subtracted from any certain year of the* Julian *Period, the Reſidue ſhews the year ſince the beginning of the Epocha of the building of the Temple: And if in like manner* 3703 *Years and* 9 *Months be ſubtracted from the ſame year of the* Julian *Period, the Reſidue demonſtrates the year ſince the finiſhing of the Structure of the Temple of* Solomon. *But if to the year of either of theſe two Epocha's the before-mentioned Sums be added, the Product, correſponds to the year of the* Julian *Period.*

Different Opinions concerning the 480 *years.*

§. 1. THere are not a few among the Interpreters of the Holy Scripture who are of Opinion that the Calculation of the 480 years computed (*g*) to have been betwixt the time of the going out of the *Iſraelites* out of *Ægypt*, till the building of the Tempie by *Solomon*, is erroneous. *Serrarius* makes this Interval inſtead of 480, 680 years; others would have it 580 years; among whom are *Melchior Canus*, *Johannes Walterus*, *Nicholaus Raimarus*, and *Hugo Grotius*: But beſides that this pretended Adulteration of the original Text, is contradictory to the Providence and Promiſe of God this Computation of 480 years is confirmed by the joint Content of the *Chaldæan*, the *Greek*, of the LXX Interpreters, the *Latin* and other Tranſlations.

Others Opinions concerning the ſame.

§. 2. Others who are not ſo forward in Contradicting the Authority of the Sacred Writ, and yet diſagree with us in our Hypotheſis, are of Opinion, that in the above-mentioned (*h*) Computation of 480 years betwixt the time of the *Iſraelites* leaving of *Ægypt* and the Epocha of the Temple of *Solomon*, are only accounted the years

(*g*) 3 Reg. 6. (*h*) Ibid.

of

of each of the Judges that ruled over *Israel*, without including the ſeveral Intervals of their Bondage or Anarchies. *Ludovicus Capellus* is of this Opinion; but above all others, (i) *Gerhardus Johannes Voſſius* patronizes this Fiction, alledging from the Authors of the Sacred Hiſtory his Intention had been only to give an Account of thoſe times the *Iſraelites* were governed by *Moſes*, *Joſhua*, the *Judges* and *Kings*, without taking any Notice of thoſe Intervals when the *Iſraelites* lived in Servitude, the Memory of which could not but be very dreadful to them. But this appears to me a very frivolous Reaſon, ſince I cannot ſee why the Time and Interval might not be inſerted with as much Eaſe as the Relation of the Servitude it ſelf. Beſides that, according to this Suppoſition, both the Time and Circumſtances of the Deſtruction of the Kingdoms of *Iſrael* and *Judah* muſt have been paſs'd by in Silence, they being much more dreadful than the Anarchies and Intervals of Servitude of the *Iſraelites*.

Some begin this Interval from another time.

§. 3. There are alſo others who maintain that the Computation of theſe 480 years ought to be interpreted not from the time they paſſed thro' the Red Sea, but from the time of the Diſtribution of the Land of *Canaan* by Lot; which Interpretation they pretend to prove to be conſonant to the Sacred Hiſtorical Phraſe from the Words in *Deuteronomy* 4. *v.* 44, 45, 46. *And this is the Law which* Moſes *ſet before the Children of* Iſrael. *Theſe are the Statutes and Teſtimonies, and the Judgments which* Moſes *ſpake unto the Children of* Iſrael *after they came forth out of* Ægypt; *on this ſide* Jordan, *in the Valley over againſt* Beth-peor, *in the Land of* Sihon *King of the* Amorites, *who dwelt at* Heſhbon, *whom* Moſes *and the Children of* Iſrael *ſmote after they were come forth out of* Ægypt. They add to this a

(i) Iſag. Chron. c. 7.

Parallel

Parallel Passage out of the 114th Psalm, v. 1, 2, 3. *When* Israel *went out of* Ægypt, *the House of* Jacob *from a People of strange Language*, Judah *was his Sanctuary, and* Israel *his Dominion*; *the Sea saw it and fled*, Jordan *was driven back*. Which has induced *Laurentius Codomannus* to affirm the above-mentioned Term of 480 years had its Beginning not till that time when the Tribe of *Dan* had its peculiar Inheritance assigned to them, according to which Supposition he computes from the first beginning of the *Israelites* leaving of *Ægypt* 599 years: and *Sabellicus*, *Melchior Canus*, and *Michael Mæstlinus* account 592 years *Dionysius Petavius*(*k*) computes 520 years, by adding 40 years (the *Israelites* were in the Desart) to the 480 years. But *Petavius*, as well as the other above-named Chronologers, have put a wrong Sence upon the Phrase of the whole Scripture in these two Passages of *Deut.* 4. and *Psalm* 114; which they alledge as Parallel to one another, there being not intended the least distinct Account of the time of the *Israelites* going out of *Ægypt*, but only mentioned in general Terms; it being evident that the going out of the *Israelites* out of *Ægypt* is in the Scripture Phrase to be understood from the time of their passing through the Red Sea. As for instance, in *Numb.* 33. v. 38. it is said, *And* Aaron *the Priest went up into Mount* Hor, *at the Commandment of the Lord, and died there in the fortieth year after the Children of* Israel *were come out of the Land of* Ægypt, *in the first day of the fifth Month.*

§. 4. *Dionysius Petavius* and some others who pretend to enlarge this Computation of 480 years, alledge that it is contradictory to the Calculation of the times of the *Judges* and Intervals of Bondage of the *Israelites*: But these Gentlemen have neglected what has long ago been ob-

Whether this Computation of 480 years be contradictory to the Sacred Writ.

(*k*) Lib. 9. de Doctr. Temp.

ſerved by ſome Interpreters, that the Intervals of the Bondage of the *Iſraelites* are included in the times of their Judges; and that ſometimes ſeveral Tribes have had their ſeveral Judges; ſo that two or more have been their Heads at the ſame time. To confirm which, let us look into the Book of the *Judges*, c. 4. v. 2. where it is related that the *Iſraelites* lived in Subjection under *Jabin* twenty years; and yet in the 4th Verſe it is added, *And* Deborah *a Propheteſs, the Wife of* Lapidoth, *ſhe judged* Iſrael *at that time.* Who can be ſo much beyond himſelf as to ſuppoſe that the twenty years of their Bondage ought to be ſeparately computed beſides the time of *Deborah*; which is confirmed by another Paſſage in the the ſame Book, where it is ſaid of *Sampſon* (*l*) *he judged* Iſrael *in the days of the* Philiſtines 20 *years.*

How the 480 *years were divided between the Kings and Judges.*

§. 5. Though it be not always requiſite in a Chronologer to give an exact Account of all the particular Intervals of time when the whole is beyond Queſtion; yet for the better Satisfaction of the Curious, we will repreſent in the following Table ſeveral Opinions of ſome of our modern Chronologers concerning theſe Intervals.

(*l*) Judges 15. 20.

From

From the time of the going out of the *Israelites* out of *Ægypt*, are computed Years according to

	Petavius.	*Is. Vos.*	*Wil. Lang.*	*Ours*	*Scripture Proofs.*
Moses,	40	40	40	40	*Numb.* 14. *v.* 33.
Joshua,	14	26	14	17	
The Seniors,	10		13		
Bondage under Chushan,	8	8	8		
Othniel,	40	40	40	40	*Judg.* 3. *v.* 10.
Servit. under the Moab.	18	18	0		
Ehud,	80	80	80	80	*Judg.* 3. *v.* 20.
Bond. under Jabin,	20	20	0		
Deb. & Bar.	40	40	40	40	*Judg.* 4. *v.* 4.
Servit. under the Midian.	7	7	0		
Gideon,	40	40	40	40	*Judg.* 8. *v.* 32.
Abimelech,	3	3	40	3	*Judg.* 9. *v.* 22.
Thola,	23	23	3	23	*Judg.* 10. *v.* 2.
Jair,	22	22	23	22	*Judg.* 10. *v.* 3.
Servit. under the Ammonit.	0	18	22		
Jephtha,	6	6	18	6	*Judg.* 12. *v.* 7.
Ibzan,	7	7	6	7	*Judg.* 12. *v.* 9.
Elon,	10	10	7	10	*Judg.* 12. *v.* 11.
Abdon,	8	8	18	8	*Judg.* 12. *v.* 14.
Bond. under the Philist.	0	40	20	18	
Sampson,	20	20	3	20	*Judg.* 15. *v.* 20.
Eli,	20	40		40	1 *Sam.* 4. *v.* 18.
Sam. & Saul,	40	32	20	40	*Acts* 13. *v.* 21.
David,	40	40	20	40	2 *Sam.* 5. *v.* 4.
Solomon,	4	3	4	4	1 *Reg.* 6. *v.* 1.
Sum,	520	667	479	480	

CHAP. XIV.

Of the Epocha of the three hundred and ninety years of the Iniquity of the HOUSE *of* Israel, *mentioned in* Ezec. *Chap.* 4. *v.* 5. & seq.

1. *The beginning of the Epocha of these* 390 *years must be fixed at the time of the General Defection of the People of* Israel *under the Reign of their King* Jeroboam, *of whom it is said frequently in the Holy Scripture, that he made* Israel *to sin: But the utmost Period of this Epocha must not be extended beyond the Destruction of the Temple of* Solomon, *this being the Intention of the Prophetical Vision, as is manifest out of Ver.* 1, 2, 7, 13, &c.

2. *Accordingly we affirm the first year of this Epocha of* 390 *years to have been coincident with the* 3734*th year, and the last year of the same Epocha with the* 4124*th year of the* Julian *Period.*

To find out the year since the beginning of this Epocha.

3. *If therefore you subtract from any certain Sum of years of the* Julian *Period* 3733 *years, the Residue shews the year since the beginning of this Epocha. And if you add the known time of this Epocha to the said* 3733 *years, the Product will be equivalent to the year of the* Julian *Period.*

The Beginning and End of this Epocha.

§. 1. *Bucholzerus Creutzhemius* and some others begin this Epocha from the fourth year of *Rehoboam* and *Jeroboam*; for which they alledge 2 *Chron.* 11. v. 17. *Tremellius* begins it from the time that *Solomon* turned his Heart from the Lord,

Lord, as *Funccius*, *Codomannus*, and some others, extend its Period till the 23d year of *Nebuchadnezzar*, or the 5th after the Destruction of the Temple. But they neglected to take notice that *Ezechiel* in this Passage speaks particularly of the Iniquity of the House of *Israel*, separately from that of *Judah*.

How long after the building of the Temple this Epocha began.

§. 2. It being expressly said, that (*a*) *Solomon* began to build the Temple in the 4th year of his Reign; and it being likewise evident that he reigned in all 40 years, it must of necessity follow, that the first year of *Jeroboam*, who at the same time with *Rehoboam* immediately succeded *Solomon*, was the 37th year after the beginning of the Building of the Temple, and consequently the 2734th year of the *Julian* Period.

CHAP. XV.

Of the End of the Reign of Sardanapalus, *and the Epocha of the* Median *Empire.*

1. Sardanapalus *was the last, and (accordiug to* Diodorus Siculus) *the five and thirtieth* Assyrian *Monarch, of the same Family with* Ninus, *descended in a direct Line and uninterrupted Succession from Father to Son; of which see* Velleius Paterculus.

2. *This* Sardanapalus *being besieged in the City of* Ninive, *by* Arbaces, *was in the third year of the Siege forced to burn himself.* Diodorus Siculus.

(*a*) 1 Reg. 6. v. 1. (*b*) 1 Reg. 11. v. 42.

3. *This Disaster hapned in the* 20*th year of his Reign.*

4. *From the time of the beginning of the* Assyrian *Monarchy till the fatal End of* Sardanapalus *are computed* 1300 *years, as has been demonstrated before in the Chapter of the Epocha of the* Assyrian Monarchy.

5. Arbaces *was the first Founder of the Monarchy of the* Medes; *and according to* Ctesias, Diodorus, *and* Eusebius *reigned* 28 *years, who*

6. *give the following Account of the Succession of the Kings of* Media.

	Years.
1. Arbaces *reigned*	18
2. Mandauces	50
3. Sosarmus	30
4. Artycas	50
5. Arbianes, *otherwise* Cardiaceas	22
6. Arsæes, *otherwise* Dejoces	40
7. Artynes, *otherwise* Phraortes	22
8. Astibaras, *otherwise* Cyaxares	40
9. Apandas, *otherwise* Astyages	35

7. *The Period of the Empire of the* Medes *is to be fixed in the first year of the Epocha of* Cyrus *the Founder of the* Persian *Monarchy, about the year* 4155 *of the* Julian *Period, after it had flourished* 317 *years.*

8. Cyaxares, *the last King but one of the* Medes *began his Reign in the* 2*d year of the* 37*th Olympiad* (*according to* (*a*) Euseb.) *and reigned* 40 *years. See* Ctes. *and* Herodot.

9. *Under the Reign of* Cyaxares *the last King but one, or the Reign of* Astyages *the last King of* Media, *there hapned a very remarkable Eclipse of the Sun. Of which* (*b*) Herodotus *speaking of* Cyaxares, This is he, who being engaged in a War with

(*a*) In Chron. (*b*) Lib. 1.

the

the *Lydians*, when they were in the very heat of Battle, the Day turned into Night. (c) Clemens Alexandrinus *makes also mention of the same Eclipse.* Eudemus, *says he*, in his Astrological History, affirms that *Thales* did foretell that great Eclipse of the Sun which happened at the time when the *Medes* and *Lydians* were engaged in a bloody Battle, under the Reigns of *Astyages* the Son of *Cyaxares* over *Media*, and of *Alyattes* the Father of *Crœsus* over *Lydia*.

From whence it may be concluded that the Disaster of Sardanapalus *hapned about the year* 3839 *of the* Julian *Period, which was also the first of the Reign of* Arbaces, *that he was succeeded by* Mandauces *in the year* 3866 *of the* Julian *Period; that about the year* 3916 *of the* Julian *Period* Sosarmus *began his Reign, whose Successor in the year* 3946 *was* Artycas, *who in the year* 3997 *was succeeded by* Cardiaceas; *that after him in the year of the* Julian *Period* 4019 Dejoces *began his Reign; in the year* 4058 Phraortes, *in the year* 4081 Cyaxares, *and in the year* 4121 Astyages; *and that lastly the Empire of the* Medes *ended with* Astyages *in the year* 4155 *of the* Julian *Period.*

Now therefore by subtracting the several above-mentioned Numbers of years of these Kings from any certain year of the Julian *Period, the true time of each of them since the beginning of their Reigns may be investigated, as may sufficiently be seen out of the foregoing Examples.*

§. 1. *Vidas*, and some others have endeavoured to deduce the Etymologies of *Sardanapalus* from the *Greeks*; but in my Opinion *Reinerus Reineccius*, and many more have with more Reasons sought for its Orignal among the *Assyrians*; to wit, from *The Etymology of Sardanapalus.*

(c) Lib. 1. Stromat.

SAR, DAN and NIPHIL, which three Words signifie GREAT, LORD, and CONQUEROR; which Title they say he assumed in the same manner as *Attila* called himself the SCOURGE OF GOD, and *Mahomet* the *Turkish* Emperor assumed the Title of TERROR OF THE WORLD.

The Occasion of the Revolution in the Assyrian Empire.

§. 2. The Effeminacy of *Sardanapalus* proved the Occasion of the Ruin of the *Assyrian* Monarchy: For *Arbaces* Governour of *Media* being admitted into his Presence as he was sitting among his Concubines in Womens Apparel, handling his Needle like the rest, took a Resolution from that time to withdraw himself from under the Jurisdiction of so Effeminate a Prince; and being encouraged afterwards by the Hopes of Success, by an *Ægyptian* Priest, famous for his Skill in Astrology, he put his Designs in Execution, and in a bloody War at last vanquished this Monarch, and became Master of the Empire.

Sardanapalus is not the same Name with Asser-Haddon.

§. 3. (d) *Schotanus* is of Opinion that *Sardanapalus* is the same with *Asser-Haddon*, who is mentioned 2 *Reg.* 19. v. 37. and in *Es.* 37. 38. to have been the Son of *Sennacherib*. But there are many Reasons to the contrary: For it is related of *Sardanapalus* that he lived a very odious and effeminate Life, according to that noted Epitaph of the *Greek* Poet *Chærilus*.

Cum te mortalem nôris, præsentibus exple
Deliciis animum, post mortem nulla voluptas.
Namque & ego cinis ecce, Nini Rex maximus olim.
Hæc habui, quæ edi, quæque exaturata libido,
Hausit; at illa jacent multa & præclara relicta.

(d) Bibl. Histor.

Where-

Whereas *Asser-Haddon*, when he began to take the Administration of the Kingdom in hand, found it in a very ill State, and was forced to wage long and bloody Wars with the Murtherers of his Father. *Herodotus*, upon whose Authority *Sobotanus* so much relies, relates that under the Reign of *Sardanapalus* the *Medians* having shaken off the *Assyrian* Yoke, enjoyed for many Years their own Laws and Liberty, free from the Oppression of their Kings, till at last *Dejoces* reduced them under a more strict Subjection. But from the time that *Asser-Haddon* succeeded his Father in the Empire, being the 14th of *Hiskiah*, and 3999th of the *Julian* Period, there was but a slender Interval till the Reign of *Dejoces*. And since it is evident that both *Sardanapalus* and *Sennacherib* were not unknown to (e) *Herodotus*, it is very improbable that he should not have mentioned the Son.

Concerning the Division of this Monarchy.

§. 4. *Annius* and (f) *Robertus Bailius* are of Opinion that after the Death of *Sardanapalus*, the *Assyrian* Monarchy was divided betwixt *Belochus* or *Belesis* and *Arbaces*; so that the first had for his share *Babylon*, and the last *Media* and *Persia*. But this is absolutely contradicted by *Diodorus Siculus*; who says that this *Belochus* being a *Babylonian* Priest, such as they call *Chaldæans*, famous for his great Skill in judiciary Astrology, who had foretold *Arbaces* the Conquest of the *Assyrian* Empire, was afterwards by him made Prefect, or Governour of *Babylon*.

Whether Phul was the same with Belochus.

§. 5. The Followers of *Annianus*, among whom are *Sleidan* and *Nicholaus Reusnerus*, are of Opinion that *Phul*, of whom mention is made in the (g) Holy Scripture, was the same *Belochus* mentioned by *Annianus* to have been Monarch of *Babylon*. But the contrary may be demonstrated

(e) Lib. 2. (f) Op. Chron. T. 1. p. 105. (g) Isag. p. 195.
2 Reg. 15. v. 19. 1 Chron. 5. v. 26.

if

if it be considered that *Sardanapalus* lived about the year 3839 of the *Julian* Period, and that *Menahem* the King of *Israel* was made tributary to *Pul* the King of *Assyria* in the year of the *Julian* Period 3943, which is above 100 years difference. Besides that, *Pul* is dignified with the Title of King; whereas we have shewed already that *Belochus* or *Belesis* was only Governour of *Babylon*.

How to reconcile the Sacred History concerning those Kings after the Death of Sardanapalus.

§. 6. Some are very sollicitous about the History of these *Assyrian* and *Chaldæan* Kings, of whom mention is made in the Scripture after the Death of *Sardanapalus*; to which I answer, that it is very probable that after the Death of *Arbaces*, the *Assyrians* might in some measure recover their ancient Liberty, and be governed by their own Kings, tho' scarce any Footsteps of them are to be found in prophane History, of which *Orosius* has given us this Compendious Account: (*h*) *Thus was the* Assyrian *Monarchy transferred to the* Medes; *but soon after heavy Wars were carried on among these Nations with various Success; which to particularize here, is beyond our Purpose: sometimes the* Schytes, *sometimes the* Chaldæans *got the upper hand; but the Empire was at last devolved again to the* Medes.

Dejoces was not the first King after Sardanapalus

§. 7. *Herodotus*, with some of his Followers, make *Dejoces* the first Monarch of the *Median* Empire; But, as has been alledged before, there are other Authors, who having been more careful in inspecting the Authentick History of the *Assyrians*, ought to be preferr'd in this Point before *Herodotus*. We have alledged the Words of *Diodorus Siculus* concerning *Arbaces* before; whose Testimony is confirmed by (*i*) *Justin*, who says expressly that *Arbactus* (*Arbaces*) formerly Governour of *Media*, was made King after *Sardanapalus*. And this seems also the most probable, if

(*h*) L. 1. c. 19. (*i*) L. 1. c. 3, 4.

it

it be taken into Consideration, that a *Democratical* Government appeared in all Ages contrary to the Genius of the *Asiaticks*: So that τὸ φύσει δεσποτικὸν of the *Medes*, was used as a Proverb among the Poets; according to *Lucan*,

Felices Arabes, Mediique, Eoaque tellus,
Quam sub perpetuis tenuerunt fata Tyrannis.

And *Virgil*(*k*) speaks to the same purpose, when he describes the Nature of the Bees.

Præterea Regem non sic Ægyptus & ingens
Lydia, nec populi Parthorum, aut MEDUS Hydaspes
Observant, rege incolumi, mens omnibus una est, &c.

The Observation made by *Reinerus Reineccius* upon this Passage of *Herodotus* seems to be very agreeable to the Truth; to wit, that perhaps the *Medes* enjoyed a great share of Liberty under their first Kings; which by degrees being degenerated into a Licentiousness, *Dejoces* was the first who re-established the Royal Prerogative and Authority.

§. 8. The Eclipse of the Sun mentioned before out of *Herodotus* and *Clemens Alexandrinus*, has been like the *Pomum Eridis* among the Astronomers and Chronologers, there being as many Opinions as Heads about it, too many to be enumerated here; but have before all the rest, chosen that of *Clemens Alexandrinus* and *Pliny*, who affirm that this Eclipse of the Sun did not happen (as *Herodotus* relates) under the Reign of *Cyaxares*, but under *Astyages*, in the year of the *Julian* Period 4129, on the 28th of *May*, towards Sun-set, which appeared the more terrible to

Concerning the Solar Eclipse mentioned by Herodotus.

(*k*) Lib. Georg. 4.

the

the *Medes* and *Lydians* engaged in the Heat of Battle, the nearer the Sun was to its Period.

The Congruity betwixt the Reigns of these Kings with the Jul. *Period.*

§. 9. The following Table shews the Congruity betwixt the Reigns of each of the *Median* Kings, and the years of the *Julian* Period, according to our and *Petavius*'s Computation; unto which we have added the Calculations of *Joseph Scaliger* and *William Lange*, somewhat different from ours.

Number and Names of the Median *Kings.*	*Ann. Regn*	*A.P. J.No.*	*A.P. J.Sc.*	*A. P. J. La*
1 Arbaces,	28	3838	3841	3852
2. Mandauces,	50	3866	3869	3880
3. Sosarmus,	30	3916	3919	3930
4. Artycas,	50	3646	3949	3960
5. Arbianes, *f.* Card.	22	3996	3999	4010
6. Dejoces, *f.* Arsæes,	40	4018	4021	4032
7. Phraort. *f.* Artyn.	22	4058	4061	4072
8. Cyaxeres, *f.* Astibar.	40	4080	4083	4093
9. Astyages, *f.* Apand.	35	4120	4123	4132
Finis.		4155	4163	4167

CHAP. XVI.

Of the Olympiad *Epocha.*

1. *An* Olympiad *is an Interval of four* Greek *Years of different Length, at the Expiration of which the* Olympiad *Games dedicated to* Jupiter Olympicus, *were solemnized among the* Greeks.
2. *The* Olympiad *Epocha is confirmed by very famous and unquestionable Characters, as by several Eclipses related by* (a) Thucydides *and others*

(a) L. 2. 4. 7.

from

From whence it is evident that the Olympiad *Epocha began in the year of the* Julian *Period* 3983, *in Summer*, Cycl. ☉. 18. ☽. 5.

3. *To have a juſt Connection of the years of the Olympiads with the* Julian *Period, ſubtract one of the Number of the Olympiads, the Reſidue multiply with* 4, *unto which add the Number of years of the* Running Olympiad; *and the Product will ſhew the time of year ſince the beginning of this Epocha: If to theſe you add* 3937 *years and* 6 *Months, the whole will be correſpondent to the year of the* Julian *Period.*

4. *But if you have before you the certain year of the* Julian *Period, and would find out what year of any Olympiad is correſpondent to it, ſubtract from the Number of years of the* Julian *Period* 3937 *years and* 6 *Months; divide the Reſidue by* 4, *and the* Quotients *and* Superplus *will ſhew the year of the Olympiad correſpondent to it.*

§. 1. THE firſt Author of the *Olympiad Games* is ſaid to have been one *Piſus*, of whom nothing is left but the Name. But *Pelops* the Son of *Tantalus* is much more famous in Hiſtory, who order'd them to be celebrated in Honour of *Jupiter Olympius*. They were afterwards revived again by *Atreus* and *Hercules*, and dedicated to the Memory of *Pelops*. Laſt of all *Iphitus* the Son of *Praxonides* did once more re-eſtabliſh this Solemnity, after it had been neglected for a conſiderable time before; ſince which time they have been continued without Interruption, and the *Olympian* Years were called likewiſe *Iphitæan* Years from *Iphitus*. *The firſt Founder of the Olympian Games.*

§. 2. The *Olympiad* Epocha is ſo much celebrated for its Certainty, that ſome account the Number of Olympiads among the Chronological Characters, yet is not free from all Diſpute: For, according to the Teſtimony of *Phlegon* and

and (*b*) *Plutarch* the *Olympian Games* were inſtituted in the time of *Iphitus* and *Lycurgus*. Furthermore (*c*) *Euſebius* makes *Lycurgus* cotemporary with *Jehu*, and his time coincident with the 1130th year of the Epocha of *Abraham*; ſo that according to this Computation, *Lycurgus* and *Iphitus* flouriſhed about the year of the *Julian* Period 3827. Furthermore, moſt of the Chronologers agree in Opinion with *Caius Julius Solinus*, who affirms that *Iphitus* revived theſe *Olympian Games* in the 408th year after the Deſtruction of *Troy*. If both theſe Computations be compared, it follows from thence, that *Lycurgus* and *Iphitus* did flouriſh both in the year of the *Julian* Period 3827, and in the year 3938, which is above a hundred years difference. To obviate this Difficulty, I ſee no better Expedient than to ſuppoſe that even after the time of *Iphitus* the ſaid Games were ſometimes diſcontinued till the time of *Eleus Coræbus*, who, according to *Pauſanias* and *Phlegon*, was the firſt who got the Victory in the Race of the *Olympian Games*. If any body can ſhew us a more convenient Explication, we are ready to agree with him in Opinion.

Concerning the Uſefulneſs of this Epocha.

§. 3. The *Olympian Games* are like ſo many Annals by which the ancient *Greeks* have computed not only their own, but alſo the Hiſtories of other Nations; from whence *Varro* has borrowed his three remarkable Diſtinctions of Time, ἄδηλον, before the Deluge; μυθικὸν, before the Olympiads, and ἱστορικὸν, ſince the beginning of the *Olympian Epocha*: And *Juſtin Martyr* and *Africanus* thus far agree with *Varro*, that before the time of this Epocha, nothing of ſolid Hiſtory has been written in *Greece*.

(*b*) In vit. Lycurg. (*c*) Lib. poſter. Chron.

§. 4

§. 4. The *Olympian Games* were celebrated in the *Elean* Fields near the River of *Alpheus* in *Peloponneſus*, which is now called *Morea*. *Pauſanias* relates, that the *Piſæans* did alſo attempt once to inſtitute the *Olympian Games* among them, but that the *Eleans* never reckoned them among the Number of their Olympiads. *Where theſe Games were celebrated.*

§. 5. There is a great difference betwixt an *Olympias* and an *Olympian Year*: *Olympias* is called both the Game it ſelf and the Quadrennial Interval; after the Expiration of which theſe Games were always renewed. Some Authors there are however, who have taken it for a Quinquennial Cycle; as in (*d*) *Ovid*, *Of how many years an Olympiad was compoſed.*

In Scythia nobis quinquennis Olympias acta eſt.

And (*e*) *Seneca*;

Quantus incedit populus per urbes,
Ad novi ludos avidus theatri,
Quantus Eleum ruit ad Tonantem,
Quinta cum Sacrum revocavit æſtas.

But in this Paſſage he ſeems to ſpeak not of the compleat, but running fifth year: And as for *Ovid*, it is poſſible he confounded his *Roman Luſtrum* with the *Greek Olympiad*; from whence I conclude that *Olympias* conſiſted of four years; and that an *Olympian* Year contained the fourth Part of an *Olympias*.

§. 6. The *Olympian Games* were fixed to a double Character; to wit, to that of the F. Moon, next following to the *Solſtitium æſtivum*, or Summer Solſtice: But by reaſon of the Ignorance of the ancient *Greeks* in Aſtronomy, the certain Days of the firſt Olympiads remain uncertain; for which reaſon it is, that *Diodorus Siculus* and *What time of the year they were celebrated.*

(*d*) L. 4. Eleg. 6. (*e*) In Here. Fur.

Pliny

Pliny have not begun their *Olympian* Years from the Summer Solstice; but from the Beginning of the *Roman* Civil Year, which has occasioned no small Dispute among the Chronologers, who did not take notice of this their Method.

Concerning the Olympian Years.

§. 7. Tho' it be beyond all Question that the *Olympian Games* were regulated according to certain Celestial Characters of the Sun and Moon; yet were the *Olympian* Years, separately considered, neither *Lunar*, nor *Solar*, nor *Lunæ-Solar*, but Political Years, consisting sometimes of 360, sometimes of 361, and 362, and again of 390, 391 and 392 Days, *&c.*

The Olympian Year consisted of 12 Months.

§. 8. The *Olympian* Year consisted of twelve Months, each Month containing 30 Days: Their Names and Order are as follows;

1. Ἑκατομβαιών,
2. Μεταγειτνιών,
3. Βοηδρομιών,

} θερεινοί, or Summer Months.

4. Πυανεψιών,
5. Μαιμακτηριών,
6. Ποσειδεών,

} ὀπωρινοί. or Autumn Months.

7. Γαμηλιών,
8. Ἀνθεστηριών,
9. Ἐλαφηβολιών,

} χειμερινοί, or Winter Months.

10. Μουνυχιών,
11. Θαργηλιών,
12. Σκιροφοριών.

} ἐαρινοί, or Vernal Months.

Unto these they added at last two Days, which they called ἀναχύς; they were also entitled ἁρμαρέσιαι, because it was the Custom in the *Grecian* Common-wealths to dedicate these two Days to the Election of their Magistrates.

§. 9. The *Olympian* Years were of two sorts, each of them admitting again of a three-fold Difference: For they were either,

Com-

Common Years, consisting of 12 Months, and these are again either
- ἀνεξαιρεσιμαῖοι, of 362 days, of which before.
- ἐξαιρεσιμαῖοι of 361 days, one day being taken out of the Month *Boëdromion.*
- δυσεξαιρεσιμαῖοι of 360 days, 2 days being taken out of the same Month.

Or *Embolimean years*, consisting of 13 Mon. by doubling the Mon. *Posideon*, and these were again either
- ἀνεξαιρεσιμαῖοι of 392 days.
- ἐξαιρεσιμαῖοι of 391 days, one day being taken out again of the Month *Boëdromion.*
- δυσεξαιρεσιμαῖοι of 390 days, one being taken out of the same Month.

§. 10. Some are of opinion that the last *Olympiad* was celebrated about the year of Christ 312, under the Reign of *Constantine the Great*; but *Cedrenus* affirms that they were continued for a considerable time after; and the last *Olympiad* was the 293d, which, according to this Computation, must be coincident with the year of Christ 393. *Concerning the End of this Epocha.*

CHAP. XVII.

Of the Epocha of the building of ROME.

1. *This Epocha must be regulated either according to the Computation of* Varro *or* Cato.
2. *Whereas* Cato *affirms, that the first Foundation of the City of* Rome *was laid in the Spring of the 24th Olympian Year; and* Varro, *that it was begun to be built in the Spring of the 23d Olympian Year; the Connection of this Epocha must be fixed to one of these above-mentioned Olympian Years.*
3. *The first Foundation of the City of* Rome *was laid on the same day the* Latines *celebrated their Feast called* Palilia.

Accordingly it must be determined, that if we follow the Computation of Cato, *the City of* Rome *was begun to be built in the year of the* Julian *Period* 3962, *Cycle* ☉. 14. ☽. 10. *but according to the Calculation of* Varro, *in the year* 3961, *Cycle* ☉. 13. ☽. 11, *on the* 21 *day of* April.

To investigate the year since the beginning of this Epocha.

If therefore, according to Cato, 3961 *years and three Months, or according to* Varro, 3960 *years and* 3 *months be subtracted from any certain year of the* Julian *Period, the Residue shews the year since the beginning of the Epocha of the building of* Rome: *But if the above-mentioned Numbers of Years and Months be added to the time of the said Epocha, the Product will be correspondent to the year of the* Julian *Period.*

Concerning the difference between Cato *and* Varro.

§. 1. NOtwithstanding this *Epocha* is the most celebrated of the whole World; yet is not free from all Disputes, occasioned by the Neg-

Negligence of the ancient *Romans*, who not only before the Times of *Cato* and *Varro* did regulate their Computations by this Epocha (which was not introduced till five or six hundred years after the Building of the City) but also afterwards did disagree in the true time, there being a whole year's difference betwixt the Computation of *Cato* and that of *Varro*. And *Dionysius Halicarnassæus* goes another year beyond both, and fixes the Epocha of the building of the City in the 25th Olympian Year; and says, that the first Feast of the *Palilia* was celebrated at *Rome* in the year of the *Jul.* Period 3963. These three Authors being of an equal Authority, and it being scarce to be determined whether the Ancient *Roman* Records of the *Consuls* or those of the *Censors* ought to be preferred, we will suspend our Judgment in this nice Point. But it ought to be observed, that *Augustus*, *Claudius*, and the other Emperours in their Proclamations followed the *Varronian* Calculation; as also *Plutarch*, *Cornelius Tacitus*, *Dion*, *Cellius*, *Censorinus*, *Onuphrius*, *Baronius*, and most of the Modern Chronologers: But the Computation of *Cato*, *Solinus*, *Eusebius*, and *Dionysius Halicarnassæus* himself, as is evident out of his (*a*) Writings. And if we believe *Capellus*, *Cicero*, *Livy*, *Pliny* and *Paterculus*, begin this Epocha promiscuously, sometimes from the *Varronian Palilia*, sometimes from the foregoing year, sometimes also from the first day of *January* of the following year. See (*b*) *Ludovicus Vives* and (*d*) *Jacobus Capellus*.

The Roman Feast called Palilia.

§. 2. It is very evident out of the *Roman* History, that the Feast called *Palilia* was one of the most celebrated at *Rome*, instituted in memory of the time of the first Foundation of this City, according to *Propertius*.

(*a*) Lib. 2. (*b*) Com. in L. 3 Augustin. de Civ. Dei. (*c*) Thematism.

Urbis Feſtus erat dixere Palilia Patres,
Hic primus cepit mœnibus eſſe dies.
Annua Paſtorum convivia, luſus in urbe,
Quum pagana madent fercula divitiis.
Quumque ſuper raros fœni flammantis acervos
Trajicit immundos ebria turba dapes.
Romulus excubias decrevit in otia ſolvi,
Atque intermiſſâ caſtra ſilere tubâ.

Which is alſo confirmed by (*d*) *Plutarch.* As to the Etymology of the Word *Palilia*, *Servius* affirms that *Pales* was called by the *Romans* the Goddeſs of Forage, whoſe Feaſt uſed to be celebrated on the 21ſt day of *April*, from whence this Feaſt was called *Palilia* in like manner as the Star called by the Modern Aſtronomers *Oculus Tauri*, which in ancient times uſed to riſe about the 21ſt of *April*, was alſo called *Palilicium*. There are ſome others who derive it *à pariendo*, and in lieu of *Palilia* would have it called *Parilia*.

Whether Romulus was the firſt Founder of Rome.

§. 3. It is the common Opinion, that *Romulus* was the firſt Founder of the City of *Rome*; but (*e*) *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſæus* ſays, *The Hiſtorians don't agree neither about the time, nor the true Founder of the City of* Rome. And (*f*) *Plutarch* ſpeaks much to the ſame purpoſe; *Notwithſtanding*, ſays he, *the moſt glorious Name of this City is ſo much celebrated among Foreign Nations, it remains as yet uncertain who was its firſt Founder.* (*g*) *Philippus Cluverius* alledges many more of this kind out of the Ancient Hiſtorians; and concludes, that the fictitious Relation of the *Greeks* concerning *Romulus* and *Remus* is ſo groſs and palpable as not to be received by People of Senſe. But though it be undeniable that the

(*d*) In Vit. Romuli. (*e*) Lib 1. (*f*) In Vit. Romuli. (*g*) Lib. 3. c. 2, in Ital. ant.

Hiſto-

History of *Romulus* and *Remus* is involved in many fabulous Circumstances, yet cannot this be alledged as a sufficient Reason to annul the Authority of so many Ancient Historians, especially since it appears very congruous to the Ancient Chronology, that about the beginning of this Epocha, from whence the *Romans* deduce the Origin of their City, lived one *Romulus*.

§. 4. (*b*) *Justus Lipsius*, with the rest, who call the History of *Romulus* in question, deny *Troy* to have been the Parent of *Rome*: But I cannot but agree with St. (*i*) *Austin*, who begins his third Book with the following Words: *The People of* Rome *owe their first Offspring to the City of* Troy, *otherwise called* Ilium. (*k*) And in another Place, *The City of* Troy, (says he) *the Mother of the People of* Rome. Accordingly there have not been wanting who have deduced the Genealogy of *Romulus* and *Remus* from *Æneas* and his Posterity; of which we have given a Scheme in the following Table; according to the Sentiment of the Poet: *Of the* Roman *Origin.*

Hæc domus Ænææ cunctis dominabitur oris
Et nati natorum, & qui nascentur ab illis.

(*b*) Ad L. 12. An. Tacit. (*i*) De Civ. Dei. (*k*) Lib. 1. c. 4.

Tros *is said to have had three Sons, to wit,*

Ilus *K. of* Troy, Ganymedes *and* Assaracus
From whom descended
Capys.
Anchyses.
Æneas, *whose first Wife was* Creusa *the Daughter of K.* Priamus, *the 2d,* Lavinia, *Daughter to K.* Latinus.

Ascanius, *who succeeded his Father.*
IULUS *who was a Priest.*

Sylvius *K. after his Brother* Ascanius.
Æneas Sylvius.
Latinus.
Alba.
Atys.
Capys.
Capetus.
Tiberinus.
Agrippa
Alladius.
Aventinus
Procas.

Numitor *expell'd by his Brother.* — Amulius.

Ægestus. — Rhea, *a Vestal Virgin.*

Romulus. — Remus.

§. 5. The Ancient *Roman* Year consisted of ten Months only, and these neither *Lunar* nor *Solar* ones, but regulated at the Pleasure of their first Founder. *March* was the first, of 31 days; *April* the second, of 30 days; the third was *May*, of 31 days; the fourth, *June*, of 30 days; *Quintilis* was the fifth, of 31 days; *Sextilis*, the sixth, of 30 days; the seventh was *September*, of 30 days; the eighth, *October*, of 31 days; *November* the ninth, of 30 days, and *December* the tenth, of 31 days: The whole year consisting of 304 days. *Feneſtellus*, *Licinius*, *Macro*, and *Scaliger*, are of Opinion, that from the time of *Romulus* the *Roman* Year was divided into twelve Months: But there are so many of the most Ancient Authors who confirm by their Authority our Assertion, that it would be superfluous to alledge them here; we will only take notice of the Words of (*k*) *Ovid:*

Of the year instituted by Romulus.

Tempora digereret cum conditor urbis in anno
Conſtituit menſes quinque *bis eſſe ſuo;*
Scilicet arma magis, quam ſidera, Romule, noras,
Curaq; finitimos vincere major erat.
Eſt tamen & ratio Cæſar, quæ moverit illum,
Errorémq; ſuum quo tueatur, habet.
Quod ſatis eſt utero matris, dum proderet infans,
Hoc anno ſtatuit temporis eſſe ſatis,

(*k*) Lib. 1. Faſtor.

Per totidem menſes à funere conjugis uxor
Suſtinet in vidua triſtia ſigna domo.

And conſidering that the Genius of *Romulus* appear'd more inclin'd to warlike Exploits than Aſtronomy, it is no great Wonder if he introduc'd ſuch an irregular Form of the year, which by reaſon of its Inconveniencies, was alter'd by *Numa Pompilius*.

How long Rome flouriſhed.

§. 6. The City of *Rome* has at ſeveral times felt the direful Effects of many dangerous Revolutions, but eſpecially when *Alaric*, after a long Siege, being at laſt become Maſter of it, ruined it with Fire and Sword, where the *Goths* exerciſed ſuch unheard of Cruelties againſt the Inhabitants, as if they intended (as *Johannes Mariana* (*l*) expreſſes it) to revenge upon them all the Injuries the World had received in former Ages from the Hands of their Anceſtors.

CHAP. XVIII.

Of the NABONASSAREAN *EPOCHA.*

1. *This Epocha is founded upon ſo many Characters as are too many to be inſerted here: We will only take notice of two ſorts: Among the firſt are to be accounted many Eclipſes related by* Ptolemy. *To the ſecond Claſs belongs the Computation of this Epocha, with Reſpect to many others, by* (*m*) Cenſorinus.

2. *From whence it appears that this Epocha begun in the year of the* Julian *Period* 3967, *Cycl.* ☉.

(*l*) Lib. 4. de reb. Hiſp. (*m*) Lib. de D. Nat. c. 21.

19.

19. D. 15. *on the 26th day of* February, *on the fourth* Feria, *in the Afternoon. But, because there is some Difference betwixt the years of this Epocha and the* Julian *years (the* Nabonassarean *years consisting exactly of* 365 *days) the Connection of these two cannot conveniently be treated of in this place.*

§. 1. THE Historians, who have frequently made use of this Epocha, yet are silent both as to the Author and the Occasion of its Origin. Thus much is certain; that its Beginning was either fixed to some remarkable Revolution or great Victory. The Opinion of *Dion. Petav.* seems not very improbable; to wit, that the *Babylonians* rebelling against the *Medes*, had chosen for their King one *Nabonassar*, whose Successors afterwards subdu'd again both the *Medes* and *Assyrians*. *The first Foundation of this Epocha.*

§. 2. Concerning the Name and Author of this Epocha there is no small Dispute among the Interpreters. Its Origin is, without question from the *Chaldæan*; for *NABO* signifies (*b*) as much as an Idol, in the *Chaldæan* Tongue; from whence *Nebuchodonosor*, *Nebuzaradan*, *Nabonid*, &c. are derived. It is also beyond all question that *Nabonassar* has been King of *Babylon*; but what *Funccius*, *Mercator* and others have affirm'd him to have been the same with *Salmanassar* and *Sardanapalus* is contrary to Truth. *Of its Founder.*

§. 3. As the Disposition of the *Nabonassarean* years owes its Offspring to the *Ægyptians*, so many of the Ancient Historians, but especially *Ptolemy*, make frequently use of this Epocha in their Computations; so that there is scarce any one Epocha which is likely to be of more use to those that are curious in Chronology than this, especially since that an Authentick Catalogue of *The Usefulness of this Epocha, and the Successors of Nabonassar.*

(*b*) Psal. 46. v. 1.

these

these Kings has been publish'd out of a *Greek* Manuscript of *Ptolemy*, wherein you may see the true Connexion of the years of the Reigns of these Kings with the years of the *Nabonassarean* Epocha. And this Catalogue being look'd upon as one of the most Authentick Pieces in Chronology; unto which we shall have occasion to have Recourse at several times hereafter I judged it not beyond our Purpose to insert here without any Alteration, this excellent Monument of Antiquity.

The Catalogue of the Kings of Assyria *and* Media.

	Anni Regn.	Συναγωγή.
Nabonassar,	14	14
Nadius,	2	16
Chinzirus *and* Porus,	5	21
Jugæus,	5	26
Mardocempadus,	12	38
Arcianus,	5	43
Abasileutus I.	2	45
Belibus,	3	48
Apronadius,	6	54
Rigebelus,	1	55
Mesessimordacus,	4	59
Abasileutus II.	8	67
Assaradinus,	13	80
Saosducheus,	20	100
Chyniladanus,	22	122
Nabopolassarus,	21	143
Nabocolassarus,	43	186
Ilvarodamus,	2	188
Niricassolassarus,	4	192
Nabonadius.	17	209

II.
The Kings of Persia.

	Anni Regn.	Συναγωγὴ.
Cyrus,	9	218
Cambyses,	8	226
Darius I.	36	262
Xerxes,	21	283
Artaxexres I.	41	324
Darius II.	19	343
Artaxerxes II.	46	389
Ochus,	21	410
Arostus,	2	412
Darius III.	4	416

III.
The Græcian *Kings.*

		Nab.	*An. Phi.*
Alexander M.	8	424	4
Philippus Aridæus,	7	431	7
Alexander Aegus,	19	443	19

IV.
The Græcian *Kings over* Egypt.

Ptolemæus Lagus,	20	463	39
Ptolemæus Philadelphus,	38	501	77
Euergetes I.	25	526	102
Philopater,	17	543	119
Epiphanes,	24	567	143
Philomater,	35	602	178
Euergetes II.	29	631	207
Soter,	36	667	243
Dionysius,	29	696	272
Cleopatra,	22	718	294

V.

V.

Of the Roman *Kings.*

	Anni Regn.	*Nab.*	*Philipp.*
Auguſtus,	43	761	337
Tiberius.	22	783	359
Caius,	4	787	363
Claudius,	14	801	377
Nero,	14	815	391
Veſpaſianus,	10	825	401
Titus,	3	828	404
Domitianus,	15	843	419
	Phil.	*Nab.*	*Phil.*
Nerus I.	1	844	420
Trajanus,	19	863	439
Adrianus,	21	884	460
Antoninus,	23	907	483

CHAP. XIX.

Of the Epocha of the Conqueſt of Samaria *by the* Aſſyrians, *and the Deſtruction of the Kingdom of* Iſrael.

1. Samaria, *the Capital of the whole Kingdom of* Iſrael, *was taken by the* Aſſyrians *in the ſixth year of* Hezekiah *King of* Judah (*a*).
2. *In the ninth year of the Reign of* Hoſea *King of* Iſrael (*b*).

(*a*) 2 Reg. 18. v. 10. (*b*) 2 Reg. 17. v. 1.

3.

3. *Under the Reign of* Shalmanaſſar *King of* Aſſyria (*c*).

4. *Some time before* Sennacherib *who in the* 14*th year of the Reign of* Hezekiah, *came up againſt the City of* Jeruſalem (*d*).

5. *As likewiſe before the time of* (*e*) Aſſarhaddon *the Son of* Sennacherib, *who transferred the Royal Seat of the* Aſſyrian *Kings from* Ninive *to* Babylon: *For the Succeſſour of* Hezekiah, Manaſſeh, *was carried by the King of* Aſſyria *to* Babylon (*f*).

6. *King* So *reigned at that time in* Egypt; *as is apparent out of* 2 Reg. 17. v. 4.

7. *From whence we conclude that the Conqueſt of* Samaria *by the* Aſſyrians *happned in the year of the* Julian *Period* 3991, *Cycl.* ☉. 15. ☽. 1.

If therefore from any certain year of the Julian *Period be ſubtracted* 3390 *years; or the ſame Number be added to any certain year of this Epocha, the Reſidue of the one, and the Product of the other will ſhew the year either of the time ſince the Beginning of this Epocha, or of the* Julian *Period.*

To inveſtigate the Year ſince the beginning of this Epocha.

§. 1. IT has been controverted among the Chronologers who this *Shalmanaſſar* was that conquer'd *Samaria*. (*g*) *Euſebius* and *Clemens Alexandrinus* confound him with *Sennacherib*. *Funccius*, *Buntingus*, *Mercator*, and ſeveral other of the moſt Learned *Modern* Chronologers, affirm this *Shalmanaſſar* to have been the ſame *Nabonaſſar* of which mention is made by *Ptolemy*. But this Opinion has been ſufficiently refuted by (*h*) *Scaliger*, by *Calviſius*, and *Behmius*. The Celeſtial Characters fixed by *Ptolemy* to the Times of *Nabonaſſar* having not the leaſt Relation to this Hypotheſis.

Who was Shalmanaſſar

(*c*) Ibid. (*d*) 2 Reg. 18. v. 13. (*e*) 2 Reg. 19. v. 37. (*f*) 2 Chr. 33. v. 11. (*g*) Chron. part. 2. (*h*) De Emend. Temp.

§. 2.

Of the Synchronism of Hosea and Ahaz.

§. 2. There arises also another Controversie concerning (*i*) *Hosea*, who is said to have slain *Pekah* in the 20th year of *Jotham*, and to have succeded him in the Kingdom. The 20th year of the Reign of *Jotham* was questionless the 4th of the Reign of *Ahaz*, who reigned 16 years: So that *Hosea* began to reign in the 4th year of *Ahaz*. But it being said 2 *Reg.* 17. v. 1. that in the 12th year of *Ahaz*, *Hosea* began to reign, the Question is, how the beginning of his Reign can be fixed both in the 4th and 12th year of *Ahaz*? Unto which it is answer'd, that the beginning of the Reign of *Hosea* may be considered in a double respect. For from the 4th year of *Ahaz*, till his 12th, he reigned as Sovereign; whereas after the said 12th year he was tributary to the King of (*k*) *Assyria*.

Of King So, mention'd in the H. Scripture.

§. 3. There is no less Dispute among the Chronologers concerning *So* the King of *Egypt*, of whom mention is made in the Scripture, whom some call *Bochorin Saitin*; others by another Name: But I take it for granted, that *Cambyses* King of *Persia*, did, according to *Eusebius* and *Herodotus*, conquer *Egypt* in the 5th or 6th year of his Reign; which, according to *Ptolemy*, was the 225th year of the *Nabonassarean* Epocha; or the 4191st year of the *Julian* Period. I will in the following Table give you a Catalogue of the *Egyptian* Kings; which from the year 4191 (to count backwards) have reigned till the year of the *Julian* Period 3991 (when the Destruction of the Kingdom of *Israel* hapned;) from whence it will appear, that at that time *Sabacus* the King of *Æthiopia* reigned in *Egypt*. In the first Column you will see the Names, and in the second, the Times of the Reigns of these Kings; in the third, the year of the *Julian* Period when they began to reign, and in the fourth,

(*i*) 2 Reg. 15. v. 30. (*k*) 2 Reg. 18. v 1-9, 10.

the

the laſt year of each of their Reigns; in the fifth you will find the ſeveral Places cited out of *Herodotus* and *Diodorus Siculus*, which confirm our Aſſertion. The Pages are cited out of *Herodotus*, according to the Edition of *Henricus Stephanus*, *An.* 1592; and out of *Diodorus Siculus*, according to the Edition of *Laurentius Rhodomannus*, *An.* 1604.

Names of the Kings.	*An. Reg.*	*Init. An. Per. Jul.*	*Fin. An. Pe. Jul.*	*Teſtimony of*
Pſammenit.	0	4190	4191	Herod. p. 187
Amaſis,	44	4147	4190	186
Apries,	25	4122	4147	173
Pſammis,	6	4116	4122	173
Necas,	17	4099	4116	172
Pſammetic.	54	4045	4099	171
Dodecharc.	15	4030	4045	Diodor. 59,60
Interregn.	2	4028	4030	Diodor. 59
Sabacus,	50	3978	4028	Herod. 161

§. 4. (*l*) *Joſephus* affirms that the *Iſraelites* were forced to quit their Country 947 years after their going out of *Egypt*, 800 years after the Death of *Joſhua*, and 260 years, 7 months, and 7 days after the Diviſion of the Kingdom under *Jeroboam*; But the Computation of *Joſephus* is contradictory to it ſelf: For according to his Calculation from the time of the *Iſraelites* going out of *Egypt*, the Deſtruction of that Kingdom muſt have hapned in the year of the *Julian* Period 4163, and conſequently later; But according to his Computation, from the time of the Diſtribution of the Kingdom this Deſtruction muſt have hapned in the year of the *Julian* Period 3973, and conſequently ſooner than our Epocha. It is therefore our

How many years the Kingdom of Iſrael flouriſhed.

(*l*) Lib. 9. c. 14. Ant.

Opi-

Opinion, that (according to the Table of the Kings of *Judah* and *Israel* which we have given heretofore) the whole Duration of the Kingdom of *Israel* from the time of *Jeroboam* till the Destruction by the *Assyrians*, was only of 257 years.

Whither the Israelites were carried.

§. 5. Concerning the Place whither the ten Tribes of *Israel* were carried into Captivity we read thus in the Holy (*m*) Scripture: *The King of* Assyria *did carry away* Israel *into* Assyria, *and put them in* Habah *and in* Habor *by the River of* Gozan, *and in the Cities of the* Medes. From whence we conjecture that the *Israelites* were dispersed in *Assyria* and *Media*, and more especially in those Provinces bordering upon the *Caspian* Sea, the *Tygris* and *Euphrates*. As to the River of *Gozan*, I am of *Fuller*'s Opinion, that the said River is the same which is since called by the *Persians*, *Cyrus*, a River of *Media*.

Of the River of Gozan.

§. 6. Some of the Ancient *Jewish* Interpreters maintain that this River of *Gozan* was the *Sabbatic River*, the Source of which they pretend to be near *Kalicut* in the *Indies*, which, they say is very boisterous six days in the Week; but during the Sabbath, very calm: But others look for it in *Media*.

Of the Opinion of Antonius Montezini.

§. 7. One *Aaron Levi*, *alias Antonius Montezini* in his Treatise writ *Anno* 5404, and dedicated to *Manasseh Ben Israel*, pretends to inform the World that in the *West Indies* he had found out a most prodigious Number of *Jews*, who being governed there by their own Laws to this day, were separated from the other *Indians* by a great River. But besides that, this Impostor sufficiently contradicts himself in his Relations, making his Fellow-Travellour sometimes a *Christian*, sometimes a *Pagan*, sometimes a *Jew*.

(*m*) 2 Reg. 17. v. 6. 18. v. 10.

Out

Our late Voyages into those Parts have sufficiently detected this Imposture. Thus much is beyond all question, that in the time of (n) *Josephus*, the *Israelites* did not inhabit *America*, but near the River *Euphrates*.

The Modern Tartars are not the Offspring of the Ancient Jews.

§. 8. *Philippus Mornæus*, *Leunclavius*, *Genebrardus*, and *Postellus* in his Description of *Syria*, are of Opinion, that the *Turks* and *Tartars* owe their Offspring to the *Jews*, which they conjecture by the great Multitude of *Jews* living in *Russia*, *Lithuania*, and some other of the most Northern Parts of *Europe*; and by some Words, as those of *Dan*, *Zabulon* and *Naphthali*, which they say are used to this day among the *Tartars*; the Etymology of which they deduce from the *Syriack* Tongue, signifying as much as the *Remainders*; and that of *Turk* as much as an *Exile* in the *Hebrew* Language: But this is contrary to the most Authentick History of those Parts, who deduce the Origin of the *Tartars* from the *Scytes*, the Posterity of *Japhat*, not of *Shem*. And concerning the Etymology of the Words they are egregiously mistaken; and it seems very strange that *Paulus Venetus* who lived in the Court of the Great *Tartar Cham*, and other Travellers should not have been able to hear the least of the *Danites*, *Naphthalites*, &c.

Of the Colonies sent by the Assyrians to Samaria.

§. 9. Concerning those Colonies that were sent by the Kings of *Assyria* into *Samaria*, we read thus in the Holy (o) Scripture: *And the King of* Assyria *brought Men from* Babylon, *and from* Cuthah, *and from* Hava, *and from* Hamah, *and from* Sepharvaim, *and placed them in the Cities of* Samaria, *instead of the Children of* Israel; *and they possessed* Samaria, *and dwelt in the Cities thereof*. Among all these the *Chutæi* were the most celebrated, according to the Testimony of (p) *Josephus*; *Colonies*, says he, *were sent out of* Persia

(n) L. 2. c. 5. (o) 2 Reg. 17. v. 24. (p) L. 9. c. ult.

but especially from the County bordering upon the River Cutah, *who fixed their Habitations in* Samaria, *and the other Cities of* Israel.

Of Asnaphar *mentioned in the Scripture.*

§. 10. The great and noble *Asnaphar* mentioned in the Holy (*q*) Scripture, is by *Reinerus Reineccius* and others taken for the same with *Shalmanassar*, by others for *Sennacherib*; But it appears sufficiently out of the second Verse of the same Chapter of *Ezra*, that this *Asnaphar* was no other than *Assarhaddon*.

CHAP. XX.

Of the Epocha of NABUCHADONOSOR, *who is in the Holy Scripture called* Nebuchadnezzar.

1. *The beginning of this Epocha is to be regulated in such a manner as not to be contradictory to the Holy Scripture, to the before-mentioned Catalogue of the Kings of* Ptolemy, *or the Authentick History of* Berosus.
2. *The* 4*th year of King* Jehoiachim *is coincident with the first year of the Reign of* Nebuchadnezzar (*a*).
3. *It was in the* 8*th year of the Reign of* Nebuchadnezzar, *that* Jehoiachim, *upon the Persuasion of* Jeremiah *the Prophet, did surrender himself to that King, who carried him to* Babylon (*b*).
4. *The Destruction of the City of* Jerusalem *happened in the* 19*th year of the Reign of* Nebuchadnezzar (*c*).

(*q*) Ezr. 4. v. 10. (*a*) Jer. 25. v. 1. (*b*) 2 Reg. 24. v. 12. (*c*) 2 Reg. 25. v. 8 Jer. 52. v. 12. 29.

5.

5. *The* 37*th year after the Captivity of* Jehoiachim *is coincident with the first year of the Reign of* Evilmerodac (*d*).

6. *And the* 127*th year in the* Nabonassarean *Epocha.*

7. *In the same year hapned the Eclipse of the Sun, according to* (*e*) Ptolemy, *which is coincident with the* 4093*d year of the* Julian *Period,* 22*d of* April.

From whence it may be concluded, that the first year of the Reign of Nebuchadnezzar *was coincident with the* 4106*th year of the* Julian *Period, Cyc.* ☉. 12. ☽. 2.

7. *If therefore the* 4105 *years be subtracted from any certain year of the* Julian *Period, the Residue shews the year since the beginning of this Epocha; and if the said* 4105 *years be added to the years of the Epocha, the Product will be correspondent to the year of the* Julian *Period.*

Any certain year given of the Jul. *Period to find the beginning of this Epocha.*

§. 1. BEsides what the Sacred History furnishes us withal concerning the *Chaldæan* Kings, *Ptolemy*, the Fragments of *Berosus*, in *Josephus*, Lib. 1. against *Appian*, and those of *Megasthenes* in (*f*) *Eusebius*, are such precious Monuments of Antiquity in relation to the *Chaldæan* Monarchy, as are not sufficiently to be valued.

Of the History of the Chaldæan Kings.

§. 2. *Johannes Annius* an *Italian* Monk, seeing that the Books of *Berosus*, *Megasthenes* and *Manethon* were in great Esteem among the Learned, did endeavour to impose some fictitious Pieces under their Names upon the World; to wit, his Commentary upon the five Books of *Berosus*, of the Antiquity of the World, *Manethon's* Supplement to *Berosus*, *Megasthenes* his Annals of *Persia*, &c. But his Imposture has been discover'd

Of the supposititious Writings published by Annius.

(*d*) 2 Reg. 25. v. 27. Jer. 52. v. 31. (*e*) Lib. 5. (*f*) Lib 9. c. 4. de præp. Evang.

long ago, especially by the difference there appears betwixt his Chronological Computations, and those extant in the Fragments of *Berosus* and *Megasthenes*.

Of the Etymology of Nebuchadnezzar.

§. 3. The Etymology of *Nebuchadnezzar* some deduce from the *Chaldæan NABO*, which signifies as much as an Idol; in like manner, as of the Words *Nebuzaradan*, *Nabonides*, *Nergal Sharezer*, &c.

Whether Nebuchadnezzar and Nabopolassar are the same.

§. 4. *Funccius*, *Mæstlinus* and *Hainlinus* are of Opinion that *Shalmanassar* of whom Mention is made in the Holy Scripture, is the same with *Nabonassar*, mentioned by *Ptolemy*; and that the beginning of the *Babylonian* Captivity ought to be fixed to the time of the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, and consequently to the 19th year of the Reign of *Nabopolassar*. But it is sufficiently apparent out of *Berosus* that *Nabuchodonosor* the Son of *Nabopolassar* carried the *Jews* into Captivity; and that *Nabuchodonosor* is the same with *Nebuchadnezzar*.

Of the time of the Reign of Nebuchadnezzar.

§. 5. And there is an exact Harmony in the Computation of the years of *Nebuchadnezzar*, betwixt the Holy Scripture and the Fragments of *Berosus*; to wit, of 43 years: For the first year of the Captivity of *Jehoiachim* was the eighth of (r) *Nebuchadnezzar*; and the 37th of his Captivity was coincident with the first year of (s) *Evilmerodach*: From whence it is evident that the foregoing year being the 36th of the Captivity of *Jehoiachim*, was the 43d and last of *Nebuchadnezzar*.

Of the difference of the Names of the Chaldæan Kings.

§. 6. Besides there is a remarkable Difference in the Names of these Kings betwixt the Sacred and prophane History. But it appears sufficiently out of the History of *Daniel*, that it was the Custom of the *Chaldæans* to change their Names.

(r) 2 Reg. 24. v. 12. (s) 2 Reg. 25. 27. Jer. 52. v. 31.

§. 7.

§. 7. There is no question that during the Septennial Vacancy of the Throne under the Reign of *Nebuchadnezzar when he was driven from among the Sons of Men* (i), the Queen in Conjunction with the chief Men of the Kingdom, had the Supreme Administration of Affairs. *Herodotus* speaks much in Commendation of a certain *Babylonian* Queen, called *Nitocris*, which perhaps may have been the Queen Consort of *Nebuchadnezzar*. *Of the Vacancy in the Reign of* Nebuchadnezzar.

§. 8. There is also some difference in the Annals of the *Babylonian* Kings; for the same year which *Daniel* calls the third of *Jehoiachim*, is called by *Jeremiah* the fourth of *Jehoiachim*. And in the *Ptolemæan* Catalogue *Nabopolassar* has no more than 21 years assign'd him for his Reign; whereas in the Fragments of *Berosus* his Reign is extended to 29 years. Unto which we answer, that First, sometimes the incompleat years are taken for the Compleat ones. Secondly, that sometimes two have reigned together at the same time; And Thirdly, that the Historians have not always been careful alike in setting down the exact Number of years. *Of the difference in the Annals of these Kings.*

(i) Daniel 5. v. 21.

CHAP. XXI.

Of the Epocha and Interval of the 70 years of the Babylonian *Captivity mentioned* 2 Chron. 36. v. 20, 21. Jer. 25. 11. c. 29. v. 10, &c.

1. *This Epocha or Interval ought to be limited according to the Teſtimony of the Holy Scripture, in the* Chronicles, Jeremiah *and* Ezekiel.
2. *The Beginning of this Epocha ought to be fixed to that time when the greateſt part of the* Jewiſh *Nation, together with their King, were carried into Captivity.*
3. *When theſe were carried away Captives, to whom* Jeremiah *writ his Epiſtle, from the 1ſt Verſe to the 11th of the 24th Chapter.*
4. *When theſe were carried away Captives, of whom many returned afterwards,* Ibid. (a).
5. *When King* Jehoiachim *was carried into Captivity, to wit, in the 8th year of the Reign of* Nebuchadnezzar (b).
6. *It was the 9th year of the Captivity when the* Babylonian *King ſate down before* Jeruſalem, *which was likewiſe the 9th of the Reign of* Zedekiah (c).
7. *The firſt year of the Deſtruction of the Temple was the 12th of the Captivity* (d).
8. *The 21ſt year of the Captivity was coincident with the 4th year of the Deſolation of the Temple of* Solomon (e).

(a) Cap. 25. v. 1. (b) 2 Reg. 24. v. 12. (c) Jer. 39. v. 1. (d) Ezek. 33. v. 21. (e) Ezek. 40. v. 1.

9. *The 5th year of the Captivity seems to be made coincident with the 30th year of* Nabopolassar *by* Ezekiel (*f*).

10. *In the 70th and last year of the Captivity,* Cyrus *was Monarch, not only over* Persia, *but also over* Babylon, *and of almost all* Asia; *so that he might well make use of these Words:* The Lord God of Heaven hath given me all the Kingdoms of the Earth (*g*).

From whence we conclude, that the first year of the Captivity happened in the year 4113 *of the* Julian *Period, Cycl.* ☉. 25. ☽. 9. *and that the said Interval ended in the year* 4183 *of the* Julian *Period.*

If therefore 4113 *or* 4183 *years be subtracted from any certain year of the* Julian *Period, the Residue shews the year since the Beginning or End of this Interval. And if the said Numbers be added to the years of the Beginning or End of this Epocha, the Product will be correspondent to the year of the* Julian *Period.*

To investigate the Beginning and End of this Epocha.

§. 1. THere are some who begin this Epocha of the 70 years Captivity in the 13th year of *Josiah*, which they end with the first year of the *Persian* Epocha, or the Reign of *Cyrus*. They have been misled into this Error, because *Jeremiah* mentions the 13th year of *Josiah*; from which time, they pretend, are to be computed 70 years to the beginning of the *Persian* Epocha. But it being evident, that in the 70th year after the 13th of *Josiah*, *Cyrus* (tho' at that time King of *Persia*) yet was not Sovereign of *Babylon*; how could he without the Approbation of the King of *Babylon*, release the *Jews* from their Captivity?

Of the differences concerning the true beginning of this Epocha.

(*f*) C. 1. v. 1, 2. (*g*) Ezr. 1. v. 2.

Whether they began with the 3d or 4th year of Jehoiachim.

§. 2. *Helvicus, Dionysius Petavius, Robertus Bailius, Vossius, Simson, Bevaldus*, with their Followers, fix the Beginning of this Epocha in the 3d or 4th year of King *Jehoiachim*; but it appears to me, that (*b*) *Jehoiachim* was never carried to *Babylon* as a Captive, but that during the eleven years of his Reign he only was tributary, or under the Subjection of (*i*) *Nebuchadnezzar* (*k*), who also made War upon his Son, because the Father had refused to obey his Commands: so that it was (*l*) *Jehoiachim*, who, with the whole Royal Family, and many thousand other *Jews*, was carried into Captivity. There is but one Objection of some Moment against us; which is, that if the Beginning of this Interval of 70 Years be computed from the Captivity of *Jehoiachim*, the same will not exactly be correspondent in its Period with the Epocha of *Cyrus*; but this Objection will be answered hereafter in its proper Place, when we shall treat of the *Babylonian* Epocha of *Cyrus*.

Whether from the first Destruction of Jerusalem.

§. 3. *Eusebius* (*m*), *Sulpitius Severus*, *Johannes Funccius* and *Hainlinus*, begin this Epocha of 70 years from the time of the first Destruction of the City of *Jerusalem*; but they have been sufficiently refuted by (*n*) *Johannes Helvicus*: besides that, *Funccius* has founded this Hypothesis upon another no less erroneous than this; to wit, that *Nebuchadnezzar* mentioned in Scripture, is the same with King *Nabopolassar* of *Ptolemy*.

Of the pretended difference betwixt Jeremiah and Ezekiel.

§. 4. Those who maintain that the Beginning of the 70 years Captivity is to be fixed in the 4th year of *Jehoiachim*, pretend that the two Prophets *Jeremiah* and *Ezekiel* differ in their Computation, as to the Beginning of this Captivity

(*b*) 1 Chron. 36. v. 6. (*i*) Dan. 1. v. 1. (*k*) 2 Reg. 24. v. 1. (*l*) 2 Reg. 24. v. 12. (*m*) In Chron. (*n*) Man. Chronol. p. 107.

to

to evince which, they have invented four several Transmigrations of the *Jews*; But without entring upon a Dispute concerning the Reality of these several Captivities, they alledge it seems very improbable that *Ezekiel* who was cotemporary with *Jeremiah*, and writ his Prophesie after him, should have inserted a different Computation from the first, and have relinquished a certain establish'd Epocha to introduce a new one, which could not but involve their Prophesies in great Obscurity and Difficulties. The Character which *Ezekiel* fixes to his Epocha, when he calls it *Our Captivity*, puts the Matter beyond question.

Of the Passage in Zechariah Concerning the 70 years.

§. 5. There is also some Dispute concerning the 70 years mentioned by *Zechariah* (o): The Words are as follows: *O Lord of Hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on* Jerusalem, *and on the Cities of* Judah, *against which thou hast had indignation these 70 years*: And, *When ye fasted and mourned in the fifth and seventh Month, even these 70 years.* And since (p) *Zechariah* lived at the time of *Darius*, and in the 2d year of his Reign had this Vision, and seems to fix the last Period of the 70 years Captivity to his time, some have from thence taken occasion to begin this Epocha from the total Destruction of the City of *Jerusalem*. But if we consult the original Text, it will be apparent, that the Prophet does not speak of the 70th year, but of 70 years which were past before the time of the Prophet *Zechariah*.

(o) C. 1. v. 12. c. 7. v. 5. (p) C. 1. v. 1. 7.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXII.

Of the Epocha of the Deſtruction of the Temple of Solomon.

1. *The Deſtruction of this Temple happened in the* 11*th and laſt year of King* Zedekiah (*a*).
2. *And in the* 11*th of the Captivity of* Jehoiachin, *when* Ezekiel *was likewiſe carried away to* Babylon, *who in the next following, being the* 12*th of the Captivity, was informed of the Deſtruction of the City* (*b*).
3. *And in the* 19*th, year of the Reign of* Nebuchadnezzar (*c*).
4. *The year of the Deſtruction of the Temple was the laſt of the Interval of the* 390 *years of the Iniquity of the Houſe of* Iſrael; *ſo that the laſt year of this Interval is coincident with the Deſtruction of the Temple of* Solomon (*d*).
5. *In the ſame year the* Jews *made a Covenant to obſerve the Sabbatic Year, in proclaiming Liberty to their Men-Servants and Maid-Servants, according to God's Inſtitution* (*e*).
6. *The year of the Deſtruction of the Temple is coincident with the third year of the* 57*th Olympiad, according to* (*f*) Euſebius.
7. *By the unanimous Conſent of the moſt authentic Hiſtorians and Chronologers, whoſe Computations are founded upon the true Connection of the before-enumerated Epocha's, and the Catalogue of the Kings of* Judah, *the Deſtruc-*

(*a*) 2 Reg. 25. v. 2. Jer. 34. v. 2. c. 52. v. 5. (*b*) Ez. 33. v. 21. (*c*) 2 Reg. 25. v. 8. Jer. 32. v. 1. c. 52. v. 12. (*d*) Ez. 4. v. 5. (*e*) Deut 15. v. 13. Jer. 34. (*f*) Chron. lib. poſt.

on

on of the Temple of Solomon *happed in the 428th year after it was begun to be built.*

8. *It happed at the same time when* KAPHRES *whom* Herodotus *calls* Apries, *reigned in* Egypt, *according to* Clemens Alexandrinus *and* Eusebius, *whose Fall is described by* Herodotus *consonant to the Prediction of* Jeremiah, *who calls this King* Pharaoh-hophra (*g*).

9. *The Temple of* Jerusalem *was laid in Ashes betwixt the 9th and 10th day of the Month* Ab, *the fifth Month in the Ecclesiastical Year* (*h*).

10. *The first Destruction of the Temple happed on the same day of the Month that the second Temple was burnt by the* Roman *Soldiers* (*i*).

From whence we conclude that the Destruction of the Temple of Solomon *happed in the year of the* Julian *Period* 4124, Cycl. ☉. 8, ☽. 1, *on the 1st day of* August, *on the 6th Feria.*

If therefore 4123 *years and* 7 *months be subtracted from any certain year of the* Julian, *the Residue shews the year since this Epocha. And if the Number of* 4123 *years and* 7 *months be added to the known year of this Epocha, the Product will be correspondent to the year of the* Julian *Period.*

§. 1. AS it is evident out of *Jeremiah*, Chap. 34, that the year of the Destruction of the Temple was a Sabbatic Year: So (*k*) *Laurentius Codomannus*, *Michael Mæstlinus*, and *Jacobus Hainlinus*, make the same year a *Jubilean* Year: But their Hypothesis being founded upon the Manumission of Servants, which according to the Mosaic Law was not only performed in the *Jubilean*, but also in the

The Destruction of the Temple happed in the Sabbatic Year.

(*g*) C. 44. v. 30. (*h*) Jer. 52. v. 12. (*i*) Jos. l. 7. c. 9, 10. (*k*) Annal. Sacr.

Sab-

Sabbatic Year, is not convincing enough to make us adhere to their Opinion: For it is expresly said in *Deut.* 15. 1. 12. *And if thy Brother*, a Hebrew *Man or* Hebrew *Woman, be sold unto thee, and serve thee six years; then in the seventh thou shalt let him go free from thee.* See *Behmius L.* 1. *Manud. Chron.* p. 79.

Of Vaphres *the* Egyptian *King.*

§. 2. Concerning the Synchronism of the *Egyptian* King VAPHRES, and the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, both *Clemens Alexandrinus* and *Eusebius* do agree: For the first makes the second year of this King coincident with the seventh year of the Reign of *Nebuchadnezzar*; and the second makes the seventh year of the Reign of *Vaphres* coincident with the second year of the forty seventh Olympiad with the eleventh year of the Reign of *Zedekiah*, with the eighth of *Astyages*, and the eighteenth of *Tarquinius Priscus*; besides that, the History of this King agrees exactly with the Prophesie of *Jeremiah*: (*l*) *Thus saith the Lord; Behold I will give* Pharaoh-hophra, *King of* Egypt, *into the Hand of his Enemies, and into the Hand of them that seek his Life*, &c. For according to (*m*) *Herodotus*, he was taken Prisoner by *Amasis*, who headed his rebellious Subjects, and was strangled by him.

(*l*) Cap. 44. v. 30. (*m*) Lib. 2.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXIII.

Of the Persian *Epocha of* Cyrus.

1. Cyrus *began his Reign in* Persia, *in the* 35*th year of the Reign of* Astyages, *according to* Herodotus.
2. *In the* 29*th or* 30*th year before his death, according to* Herodotus *and* Ctesias.
3. *In the first year of the* 55*th Olympiad, according to* Diodorus, Thallus, Castor, Polybius, Phlegon, *cited by* (*a*) Eusebius.
4. *The seventh year of* Cambyses, *which was the* 37*th since the beginning of this Epocha, was the* 225*th of the* Nabonassarean *Epocha, at what time there was an Eclipse of the Moon, according to* (*b*) Ptolemy.
5. *The* 20*th year of the Reign of* Darius Hystaspes, *being the* 58*th since the Beginning of the Reign of* Cyrus *in* Persia, *is coincident with the* 246*th year of the* Nabonassarean *Epocha, when there hapned another Eclipse of the Moon, according to* Ptolemy.
6. *The* 31*st year of the same* Darius Hystaspes, *or the* 69*th since the beginning of the* Persian *Epocha of* Cyrus *was the* 257*th year of the* Nabonassarean *Epocha, when, according to* Ptolemy, *there hapned another Eclipse of the Moon.*
7. *The ancient* Persian *Empire, to reckon from the first year of the Reign of* Cyrus, *did stand* 728 *years according to* Agathias.

From these Characters we conclude, that the first year of the Reign of Cyrus *was coincident with*

(*a*) Lib. 10. de Præp Evang. (*b*) Lib. 5.

the

the 4155 *year of the* Julian *Period, or at leaſt, with the latter End of the* 4154*th year, Cycl.* ⊙. 10. ☽. 13.

To inveſtigate the year ſince the beginning of this Epocha.

If therefore 4154 *years be ſubtracted from any certain year of the* Julian *Period, the Reſidue ſhews the year ſince the beginning of the* Perſian *Epocha of* Cyrus. *Or if* 4154 *years be added to the known year of the ſaid Epocha, the Product will be correſpondent to the year of the* Julian *Period.*

Of the Uncertainty of the ancient Perſian *Hiſtory.*

§. 1. *BEroaldus*, with ſome others, is of Opinion, that the ancient Hiſtory of the *Perſian* Empire is involved in ſo many fictitious Relations by the *Greeks*, that it is leſs difficult in our Eye to judge of the Truth of that Hiſtory, than it was at the times of *Herodotus*, *Joſephus*, *Manetho*, *Megaſthenes*, or *Cteſias*, to whom we are beholding for the moſt ancient Monuments of Antiquity in the *Perſian* Hiſtory. Yet they ſeem to be too ſevere in their Judgment, it being beyond all queſtion, that theſe, as well as many others of the ancient prophane Hiſtorians, have confirmed their Computations by undeniable Celeſtial Characters; and therefore not to be abſolutely rejected, by reaſon of the Mixture of ſome fabulous Relations.

Of the Certainty of the Beginning of this Epocha.

§. 2. There is not any other Epocha which is ſo well eſtabliſhed by the General Conſent of all the ancient Hiſtorians in reference to the time of the *Olympiad*, than the *Perſian* Epocha of *Cyrus*, who all agree, that *Cyrus* began his Reign in *Perſia* at the time when the fifty five *Olympiad* Games were celebrated in *Græcia*.

Of the Reign of Cyrus.

§. 3. But concerning the time of his Reign, and of his Death, there are various Opinions. *Lucianus* allots him a hundred years, and (*c*) *Cicero* threeſcore and ten; of which he reign'd 30

(*c*) Lib. 1. de Divin.

years;

years. But as this Epocha is founded upon the time of his Reign; So it is sufficient for us to know, that according to *Ctesias*, *Dionysius*, *Justin*, *Eusebius* and *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Cyrus* reigned in all 30 years. *Herodotus* speaks of 29, and *Sulpitius* of 31 years.

Concerning the different Opinions of Xenophon and Herodotus about Cyrus.

§. 4. There is a remarkable Difference betwixt the Chronological Computations of *Xenophon* and *Herodotus* concerning the Reign of *Cyrus*. For *Xenophon* makes *Astyages* the last but one among the *Median* Kings; whereas *Herodotus* affirms him to have been the last. *Xenophon* relates that *Astyages* died in Peace when *Cyrus* was but very young, leaving the Kingdom to his Son *Cyaxares*; but *Herodotus* says, that *Cyrus* conquered *Astyages*. *Xenophon* says, that the Father of *Cyrus* was one of the Princes of *Persia*, descended from *Perseus*; and that he had all the Advantages of a most generous Education in his Father's and Grandfather's Court; whereas *Herodotus* makes him the Son of one *Cambyses* of an ignoble Birth; and that without the Knowledge of his Grandfather he was educated among the Shepherds. *Xenophon* allots no more than 11 years for the Reign of *Cyrus*; but *Herodotus* 29. The first says he died upon his Bed; the last, that he was slain in the War against *Tomyris* the Queen of the *Massagetes*. In answer to which we will alledge the Words of *Cicero*: *Cyropædia Xenophontis non ad fidem historicam, sed ad effigiem justi imperii atque optimi principis est conscripta.*

Of the Succession of Cyrus and Duration of the Persian Empire.

§. 5. The Dispute is no less great among the Chronologers concerning the Succession and true Computation of the years of the *Persian* Monarchs in order to reconcile the Prophane History with the Sacred Writ. The *Jews* allow of no more than four *Persian* Kings mentioned in the Scripsures: *Beroaldus* and his Followers don't contract the *Persian* Monarchy into so narrow a Com-

Compaſs, allowing 130 years to this Empire, but cannot agree in the Chronological Computation, and what Character to allot to each of theſe Monarchs; as may be ſeen out of the following Table, ſet down by *Beroaldus*.

Cyrus *Major*.
2. Aſſuerus Artaxerxes.
3. Darius Aſſyrius.
4. Artaxerxes Pius.
5. Xerxes *the Terror of* Greece.
6. Artaxerxes Longimanus.
7. Darius Nothus.
8. Artaxerxes Mnemon.
9. Ochus.
10. Arſes, *otherwiſe* Arſanes.
11. Darius Codomannus, *Brother of* Arſanes, *Son of* Ochus.

But if we follow the Footſteps of the *Ptolemean* Catalogue, of *Herodotus*, *Thucydides*, *Cteſias*, *Juſtin*, *Diodorus*, *Beroſus*, and many others, the following Table gives an exact Account of the Succeſſion and Chronology of the *Perſian* Kings:

	Compleat Years.
1. Cyrus *Major*,	29
2. Cambyſes cum Magis,	8
3. Darius Hydaſpes,	34
4. Xerxes,	21
5. Artaxerxes Longimanus,	43
6. Darius Nothus,	19
7. Artaxerxes Mnemon.	43
8. Ochus,	23
9. Arſes,	3
10. Darius Codomannus,	5
The Total Sum of the Years of the Perſian *Kings*,	228

§. 6.

§. 6. The Character mentioned by *Plutarch*, in the laſt year of the Reign of *Darius Codomannus*, much ſtrengthens our Opinion concerning the Duration of the *Perſian* Empire: For he ſays, That at that very time when the laſt Battle was fought betwixt *Darius* and *Alexander*, there happned an Eclipſe of the Moon; which, according to the true Aſtronomical Calculation, was in the 446th Olympian Year, or in the ſecond year of the 112d Olympiad, on the twentieth day of *September*; which evidently proves the Miſtake of *Beroaldus*, who affirms, that the Death of *Darius* happned in the firſt year of the 113th Olympiad. If therefore a true Balance be made betwixt the 217th Olympian Year, being the firſt of the 55th Olympiad, when *Cyrus* began to reign in *Perſia*, and the 446th Olympian Year, it will demonſtratively appear, that the *Perſian* Empire, according to our Aſſertion, flouriſhed about 228 or 229 years. (d) *Of the laſt Period of the Perſian Monarchy.*

(d) In Vit. Alexand.

CHAP. XXIV.

Of the Babylonian *Epocha of* Cyrus, *and the End of the first Monarchy.*

1. Cyrus *put an End to the first Monarchy by the Conqueſt of* Babylon, *under the Reign of* Darius Medus, *who being called in prophane Hiſtory* Nabonnedus, *ſucceeded* Balthaſar *in the* Babylonian *Empire, according to* Beroſus, Herodotus, Ptolemy, *and many others.*

2. Cyrus *marched with a vaſt Army out of* Perſia, *and after having carried Fire and Sword thro' Aſia, attack'd* Babylon *in the 17th year of* Nabonnedus, *according to* Beroſus.

3. *From the firſt year of the* Babylonian *Epocha of* Cyrus *till the beginning of the Reign of* Cambyſes, *according to the Celeſtial Characters mentioned by* Ptolemy, *are accounted* 9 *years.*

4. *From the beginning of the* Nabonaſſarean *Epocha till the time of* Cyrus, *are accounted by* Ptolemy 209 *years.*

From theſe Characters it is concluded, that the firſt year of the Babylonian *Epocha of* Cyrus, *mention'd in Prophane Hiſtory was coincident with the* 4176*th year of the* Julian *Period*, *Cycl.* ☉. 4. ☽. 15.

To find out the year ſince the Beginning of this Epocha.

If therefore 4175 *years be added to any certain year of the* Babylonian *Epocha of* Cyrus, *according to the Calculation of the Prophane Hiſtorians, the Product will ſhew the year of the* Julian *Period. And if the ſaid* 4175 *years be ſubtracted from the known year of the* Ju-

Julian Period, the Residue will shew the year since the Beginning of this Epocha.

§. 1. THere are some who don't allow of any difference betwixt the *Persian* and *Babylonian* Epocha of *Cyrus*; but maintain, that in one and the same year he made himself Master of *Persia*, *Media*, *Assyria* and *Babylon*; which being repugnant to all the best Monuments of Antiquity, it is a Wonder to me how some among the Learned could be misguided into this Opinion. *Whether the* Babylonian *and* Persian *Epocha of* Cyrus *be the same*

§. 2. There are some who affirm that *Balthasar* was the last King of *Babylon*, who was vanquished by *Cyrus* in Conjunction with *Darius* the King of the *Medes*; being misguided by the Authority of (a) *Josepus*, whose Words are as follows: Abilamerodach *died in the* 18*th year of his Reign, and was succeeded by his Son* Nigliſar, *who reigned* 40 *years. After his Death succeeded his Son* Laboſordach, *who dying about* 9 *Months after, the Kingdom was devolved to* Balthaſar, *whom the* Babylonians *call* Naboandel. *He was engaged in a bloody War against* Cyrus *King of* Perſia, *and* Darius *King of* Media; *and whilſt he was beſieg'd in* Babylon, *was ſurpriſed by a moſt prodigious Viſion; and not long after both* Balthaſar *and the City fell into the Hands of* Cyrus *King of* Perſia, *who took* Babylon *in the* 17*th year of the Reign of* Balthaſar, *&c.* But *Joſephus* is miſtaken in this Relation, as may appear out of the Fragments of the true *Beroſus* inſerted by (b) *Joſephus* himſelf: For *Laboſordach* mentioned by *Joſephus*, is the ſame with *Balthaſar*: Neither chapned the Conqueſt of *Cyrus* under his Reign: Neither did *Darius* the *Median* conquer the Kingdom of *Babylon*; But, accor- *Whether* Balthaſar *was the laſt King of* Babylon.

(a) Lib. 10. c. 12. Ant. (b) Lib. 1. contra App.

ding to *Berosus* and *Megasthenes*, was declared King of the *Babylonian* Empire.

Whether Darius Medus *is the same with* Nabonnidus,

§. 3. It is also called in Question by some whether *Darius* the *Median* mentioned in the Scripture, is the same with *Nabonnidus*, mentioned by *Herodotus* and other Historians; because that *Nabonnidus* is called by *Berosus*, the *Babylonian*; but *Darius* is surnamed in the Scripture the *Median*: But since *Darius* is mentioned in the Scripture as the immediate Successour of *Belsazar* (who in prophane History is called *Laborosoradach*) and that the other Historians have made *Nabonnidus* (or *Laponytus* as *Herodotus* calls him) it seems more than probable that these two Names belong to one and the same Person, especially since *Megasthenes* says of the *Babylonians*. *They declared* Nabonnichus *a Foreigner their King.*

Of the Opinion of Xenophon *concerning* Darius Medus.

§. 4. *Henricus Buntingus*, with some others, relying upon the Authority of *Xenophon*, would make this *Darius Medus* the same with *Cyaxares*, mentioned in prophane History. But concerning the Authority of *Xenophon* we have spoke sufficiently before.

Darius Medus *was not the Son of* Astyages.

§. 5. There are also many learned Authors, who being misled by *Josephus*, would have this *Darius* to have been the Son and Successor of *Astyages*, and Uncle to *Cyrus*. But tho' *Darius* was originally of *Media*, (*c*) yet he is not called King of *Media*, but of *Chaldæa*; And *Justin* sufficiently contradicts this Opinion, when he says, Astyages *had no Male Issue.*

Of the Conquest of Babylon.

§. 6. According to *Berosus*, whose Fragments are inserted by *Josephus*, *Cyrus*, after he had vanquished *Darius*, besieged the City of *Babylon*; which being well provided with Provisions sufficient to sustain a long Siege, the Inhabitants

(*c*) Dan. 9. ver. 1.

ibid

bid Defiance to the *Perſians*, who at laſt having found means to drain the River of *Euphrates*, (which runs through the City) by diverting its Courſe into the adjacent Marſhes, ſurpriſed the City. *Herodotus* relates, that the *Perſians*, the better to put their Deſign in Execution, had pitch'd upon a Day, which being one of the Feſtivals among the *Babylonians*, they were buſied in Dancing and other Jollities. The Prophet (*d*) *Iſaiah* ſeems to have foretold this Deſtruction of the River of *Euphrates*, when he ſays of *Cyrus*, *That ſaith to the Deep, be dry; and I will dry up thy Rivers*: as the Conqueſt of *Babylon*, in the Abſence of their King, was foretold by (*e*) *Jeremiah*: *One Poſt ſhall run to meet another, and one Meſſenger to meet another, to ſhew the King of* Babylon *that his City is taken at one End, and that the Paſſages are ſtopt, and the Reeds they have burnt with Fire, and the Men of War are affrighted*, &c.

§. 7. There is alſo a Conteſt among the Chronologers whether *Cyrus* conquer'd the *Babylonian* Empire after he had vanquiſhed *Crœſus*, or before. *Juſtin* relates, that *Crœſus* aſſiſted the *Babylonians* againſt *Cyrus*; who, after the Conqueſt of *Babylon*, marched into *Lydia* againſt *Crœſus*, who was vanquiſhed and taken Priſoner by him. But *Herodotus* ſays expreſly that *Cyrus* vanquiſhed *Crœſus* before the Conqueſt of *Babylon*; and *Euſebius* (*f*) and *Julius Solinus* Cap. 7. agree in Opinion, that the Conqueſt of *Lydia* happened in the firſt year of the 58th Olympiad. (*g*) *Jeremiah* ſeems to favour the laſt; when after he had mentioned all the other Kings before, he ſays thus of the King of *Babylon*; *And the King of* Sheſhach *ſhall drink after them.*

Whether Cyrus *conquered* Babylon *before* Craſus.

(*d*) Cap. 44. v. 27. (*e*) C. 51. v. 31. (*f*) Chronic. (*g*) C. 25. v. 26.

Of the first year of Cores ment on'd in the Scriptures.

§. 8. Some of the Chronologers make the first year of the *Babylonian* Epocha of *Cyrus* coincident with the same year which is in the Scriptures called the *First Year of* Cores. They alledge in their behalf, that to reckon backwards from the fourth year of King *Jehoiachim* (when according to the Opinion of some, the Flower of the *Jewish* Nation was carried into Captivity by *Nebuchadnezzar*) to the first year of the *Babylonian* Epocha of *Cyrus*, compleats exactly the time of 70 years; and that the Conquest of *Babylon* by *Cyrus*, and his Deliverance of the *Jews* out of their Captivity, is agreeable to the Prophecy of (*h*) *Jeremiah*; *And it shall come to pass when 70 years are accomplished, that I will punish the King of* Babylon *and that Nation, saith the Lord, for their Iniquity, and the Land of the* Chaldæans; *and will make it perpetual Desolations.* But I must needs give the Preference to the Opinion of *Scaliger*, who makes a difference betwixt these two *Æra's*. For it being evident out of (*i*) *Ezekiel* and several other Passages alledged before of the Holy Scripture, that the End of the 70 years Captivity mentioned under the first year of *Cores*, must be accounted backwards to the time of *Jehoiachim*. This time is in no wise agreeable to the Calculation of *Berosus*'s and *Ptolomy*'s *Babylonian* Epocha of *Cyrus*. There is also another Objection to be made against this first year of the *Babylonian* Epocha; to wit, that since, by the Consent of most Historians, *Cyrus* reigned 9 years after, it is very probable that the *Jews* would not have neglected in all this time to rebuild the Temple; especially, since it is evident out of (*k*) *Ezra*, that *Cyrus* never recalled the said Edict. For which Reason it appears more probable that the first year of

(*h*) C. 25. v. 12. (*i*) C. 24. v. 1, 2. c. 33. v. 21. c. 40. v. 1.
(*k*) C. 2. v. 3.

Cores

Cores mentioned in the Scripture, was not long before his Death, it being elſe very difficult to imagine how *Cambyſes* the Succeſſour of *Cyrus* could have prevented the ſame Edict to be put in Execution. And here it is very obſervable, that in prophane Hiſtory the year when *Cyrus* entred the *Babylonian* Empire and vanquiſhed *Darius*, is expreſly mentioned; but the Conqueſt of the City of *Babylon*, which in all Probability, tranſcend a conſiderable time, is paſs'd by in ſilence. From whence it is apparent, that the Prophane Hiſtorians fix the Beginning of the *Babylonian* Epocha of *Cyrus* to that time when he vanquiſhed *Darius*: But it ſeems as if the Holy Scripture underſtood by the firſt year of *Cores* the ſame year when he made himſelf Maſter of the Capital City of *Babylon*, as it is with the *Æra Actiaca*; which ſome begin from the Battle of *Actium*; others from the Conqueſt of *Alexandria*. There is alſo another Obſervation to be made, That the Words in the Original Text do not expreſly denote the *Firſt Year of* Cores; but rather *One of the Years of* Cores; which, I wonder how it ſhould ſlip the Obſervation of ſo many Interpreters.

CHAP. XXV.

Of the Epocha of the Baniſhment of the Roman *Kings, and the Eſtabliſhment of the Conſular Dignity.*

The Characters of this Epocha are

1. *The Baniſhment of the* Roman *Kings, and the Eſtabliſhment of the Liberty of the People of* Rome.
2. *The Eſtabliſhment of the Conſular Dignity in* Rome.
3. *The Interval of 244 years betwixt the Epocha of the Building of the City of* Rome *and this Epocha, as may be gathered from* Livy, Meſſala, Corvinus, *and ſeveral other* Roman *Hiſtorians.*
4. *The firſt* Conſulate *of* L. Junius Brutus *and* L. Tarquinius Brutus, *the laſt of which enjoyed this Dignity but for a very little time, being obliged to abdicate himſelf from the* Conſulate *by reaſon of his Name and Affinity with the Royal Family, and was ſucceeded by* P. Valerius Poplicola.
5. *The Kings were baniſhed* Rome *at the ſame time that thoſe of* Athens *were delivered from the Tyranny of the* Piſiſtratides, *according to* Pliny, Lib. 34. c. 4.
6. *The firſt* Tarentin *Games, after the Baniſhment of the* Roman *Kings were inſtituted by* Valerius Poplicola, *according to the Teſtimony of* Valerius Antias in Cenſorinus, c. 17.
7. Pythagoras *of* Samus *was in* Italy *at the ſame time when* L. Brutus *freed his Native Country from*

from the Tyranny of the Roman *Kings* Cic. Tusc. 4.

8. *Soon after the Baniſhment of the* Roman *Kings, the Temple of* Jupiter Capitolinus *was dedicated by* M. Horatius Pulvillus *who was choſen Colleague to* Poplicola *after the Death of* Brutus *who was ſlain in the Field, according to* (a) Tacitus *and* (b) Valerius Maximus.

9. *The 6th Day of the Calends of* March, Tarquin *the laſt of the* Roman *Kings was forced to leave the City, the Baniſhment of the* Roman *Kings being by the ancient* Roman *Hiſtorians fixed to that day.*

Theſe and innumerable other Characters ſhew the year of this Epocha to have been coincident with the year 4206 *of the* Julian *Period, Cycl.* ☉. 6. ☽. 7. *in the Beginning of the Spring, which time we look upon as to be unqueſtionably in reference to the Baniſhment of the* Roman *Kings.*

If therefore from any certain year given of the Julian *Period be ſubtracted* 4205 *years and* 2 *Months, the Reſidue ſhews the year ſince the Baniſhment of the* Roman *Kings; And if the before-mentioned Sum be added to the year of the ſaid Epocha, the Product will be correſpondent to the year of the* Julian *Period.*

Any year given of the Julian *Period to find out the year ſince the beginning of this Epocha.*

§. 1. THE ancient Hiſtorians make mention of theſe ſeven following *Roman* Kings:

	Years.
1. *Romulus*, who reigned	37
A Vacancy of the Throne, which laſted	1
2. *Numa Pompilius*, who reigned	43
3. *Tullus Hoſtilius*, who reigned	27
4. *Ancus Martius*, who reigned	24
5. *Tarquinius Priſcus*, who reigned	38
6. *Servius Tullius*, who reigned	44
7. *Tarquinius Superbus*, who reigned	25
The Sum	244

(a) Hiſtor. l. 3. (b) L. 5. c. 19.

§. 2.

§. 2. The Occasion of the Banishment of the *Roman* Kings, and the Establishment of the Consular Government mentioned by *Livy*, *Florus*, *Aurelius Victor*, and other *Roman* Historians, is contracted by (c) *Cicero* in these following Words; Lucretia *being ravished by the King's Son, laid violent Hands upon her self. The Grief conceived at so extraordinary an Action by the People of* Rome, *proved the real Cause of the Liberty of their City under the Conduct of* Brutus.

§. 3. The Annual Government of the *Roman* Consuls being looked upon as so many Characters of Time, by the Ancients, have been very industrious in ordering the Catalogue of these Consuls; but they all are fallen short from what has been done in this kind, since in the year 1547 the Publick Records called *Tabulæ Capitolinæ*, were found at *Rome*, which (as it is supposed) were first collected by *Verrius Flaccus Grammaticus*, by Command of the Senate, and afterwards published under the Reign of *Augustus*, *Cuspinianus*, *Carolus Sigonius*, and *Onuphrius Panvinius* had the chief Management in restoring and ordering this Catalogue; but notwithstanding all their Ingenuity and Industry, have not been able to supply the Defect of four Pair of Consuls that were wanting in these Records. I cannot but agree with *Calvisius* in this Point; who attributes this Defect of these four Pair of Consuls, to the Irregularity of the Ancient *Roman* Calendar.

(c) L. 2. de Fin.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXVI.

Of the Epocha of the first War betwixt the Greeks *and* Persians, *or the time of the Battel fought near* Marathon.

1. *All the Ancient Authors who have made mention of this War, agree that the* Persians *and* Greeks *were first engaged in War after the burning of the City of* Sardis, *and the Baniſhment of the* Piſiſtratides *from* Athens.
2. *The Battel of* Marathon *was, according to* Thucydides, *fought in the 20th year after the Baniſhment of* Hippias *from* Athens.
3. *At which time* Darius Hyſtaſpes *Father of* Xerxes *reigned over* Perſia, *whoſe Generals were* Datis *and* Artaphernes, *Son to* Artaphernes, *Brother of* Darius; *and the* Athenians *had choſen* Miltiades *their General; as may be ſeen in* Herodotus, Plutarch, Juſtin, Cornelius Nepos, *and a great many others.*
4. *This Defeat of the* Perſians *happned in the fifth or ſixth year before the Death of* Darius: *So that the Battel of* Marathon *was fought in the* 31*ſt year of the Reign of* Darius Hyſtaſpes, *according to* Herodotus.
5. *In the ſame* 31*ſt year of* Darius *there happned a notable Eclipſe of the Moon, which* Ptolemy *obſerves to have been, in the Night betwixt the third and fourth day of the month* Tybis, *in the year of the* Julian *Period* 4223, *on the* 25*th of* April, *the* 4*th* Feria.
6. *The* Athenians *obtained this ſignal Victory when* Phanippus *was* Archon *(or Prince) of* Athens, *who*

who was succeeded by Ariſtides, *as may be ſeen in* (e) Plutarch. After *Phanippus (ſays he)* under whoſe Government the *Athenians* vanquiſhed the *Perſians* near *Marathon*, *Ariſtides* was conſtituted *Archon*.

7. *At the ſame time* Macerinus *and* Augurinus *were* Conſuls *at* Rome, *according to* Sulpitius Severus.

8. *The Battel of* Marathon *was fought in the 16th year after the Death of* Brutus, *who freed his Native Country from the Kingly Government, according to* Dionyſius Halicarnaſſæus.

9. *Of this Expedition* (f) Plato, *with whom agree* (g) Thucydides *and* (h) Lyſias, *has the following Words*: About ten years before the Sea-Fight near *Salamis*, *Datis* came with the *Perſian* Fleet into *Græcia*, by the Order of *Darius*, who had expreſly commanded him under pain of Death to conquer and carry away Captives the *Eretrians* and *Athenians*.

10. *The* Athenians *obtained this Victory over the* Perſians *towards the End of the 260th year after the Building of the City of* Rome, *according to the Obſervations of* (i) A. Gellius *and* Sulpitius Severus.

11. *The Battel of* Marathon *was fought either before, or juſt at the time of the Full Moon, as it evident out of what* (k) Herodotus *has obſerved concerning the* Lacedæmonians, *who at the Requeſt of* Phidippus, *were to aſſiſt the* Athenians. *Theſe are his Words*: The *Lacedæmonians* were not unwilling to aſſiſt the *Athenians* againſt the *Perſians*: but they were not at that time in a Condition to put it immediately in Execution, being forbidden by their Laws;

(e) In Vit. Ariſt. (f) L. 3. de Leg. (g) Lib. 1. (h) Orat. 31. (i) Lib. 17. c. 21. (k) Lib. 6.

it

and being the ninth Day of the Month; on which day the Soldiers refuſed to march, as being juſt upon the Point of the Full Moon.

12. (l) Plutarch *obſerves that the Battle of* Marathon *was fought on the 6th day of the Month* Boëdromion, *and inſerts a whole Catalogue of Days of the Month* Boëdromion, *which prov'd fatal to the* Perſians. On the 6th day of the Month *Boëdromion* (*ſays he*) the *Perſians* were defeated by the *Greeks* at *Marathon*, on the 3d of the ſame Month near *Plataeæ*, on the ſame day near *Mychale*, on the 26th at *Arbelas*. The *Athenians* vanquiſhed the *Perſians* at Sea near *Naxus*, under the Command of *Chabrias* their General, near the Full Moon of the Month of *Boëdromion*, and near *Salamis*, on the 20th day of the ſame Month.

According to the ſeveral Obſervations and Teſtimonies of the Ancient Hiſtorians concerning this Signal Victory, we agree with Scaliger, *that this Battle was fought in the year of the* Julian *Period* 4223, *Cycl.* ☉. 23. ☽. 5. *towards Autumn, or about the time of the Full Moon in* Auguſt, *which happned in that year, on the 21ſt day of the ſame Month, which* Scaliger *being miſguided by the* Athenian *Years, has fixed on the 5th day of* October.

If therefore from any certain given year of the Julian *Period be ſubtracted* 4222 *years and ſeven Months, the Reſidue ſhews the year ſince the Victory obtained at* Marathon: *Unto which, if the above-mentioned Sum be added, the Product is correſpondent to the year of the* Julian *Period.*

Any certain year given of the Julian *Period to find out the year ſince the beginning of this Epocha.*

(l) In Camill.

The Occasion of the War betwixt the Persians and Greeks.

§. 1. THE War betwixt the *Greeks* and *Persians* was occasioned thus: The *Ionians* inhabiting the Sea-Coasts of *Asia*, had rebelled against *Darius*; and being assisted by the *Athenians*, had burnt the City of *Sardis*; which so incensed *Darius*, that he ordered one of those who attended him at Supper, to repeat every day thrice these Words, MY LORD, REMEMBER THE ATHENIANS. Another Cause was the Banishment of the *Pisistratides* by the *Athenians*, who also grosly abused the Ambassadors sent by *Darius*. *Hippias*, who was descended from the Family of the *Pisistratides*, and likewise banished *Athens*, was not idle in improving these Opportunities to his Advantage; and to stir up *Darius* against the *Athenians*, which at last turned to his own Destruction, he being slain in the Battle of *Marathon*, as is evident out of (*m*) *Justin* and (*n*) *Cicero*.

The vast Army of Darius.

§. 2. Those who have left us the History of these Times affirm, that *Darius* sent a Fleet of 600 Ships into *Greece* under the Command of *Datis* a *Median* by Birth, and *Artaphernes* the Son of his Brother *Artaphernes*; who, together with *Hippias* and an Army of 200000; or, as some will have it, 300000 Foot, and 10000 Horse, invaded *Greece*, but with very ill Success. Of which *Herodotus*, *Justin*, *Probus*, and others may be consulted.

Of the Bravery of the Athenians.

§. 3. The *Athenians*, who saw themselves not in a Condition to oppose a proportionable Force to that of their Enemies; yet did not lose Courage; but having gathered what Forces they could, both of their own and amongst the *Platæans*, who were the only People that assisted the *Athenians*; they, with 10 or 11000 Men,

(*m*) L. 2. c. 9. (*n*) Ad Attic. 9. Ep. 12.

cou-

courageously encountred the *Persians*; which Heroick Action of the *Athenians* is very pathetically represented by (o) *Lysias* the *Athenian*, and one of the ten Orators of *Greece*: Neither ought it to be pass'd by in Silence what is observed by (p) *Maximus Tyrius*; to wit, that the *Athenian* Forces were for the most part composed of Country Fellows, who, at the News of the Enemies landing at *Marathon*, flock'd in from the adjacent Countries to defend their Native Country against so powerful an Invasion.

Whether the Battle of Marathon was fought on the 6th day of the Month Boëdromion.

§. 4. *Sethus Calvisius* is of Opinion that *Plutarch* was mistaken in his Relation, when he says that the Battle of *Marathon* was fought on the sixth day of the Month *Boëdromion*: because, says he, this Battle happed just at the N. Moon, but in the *Athenian* Years the F. Moon could not happen on the sixth day of the Month *Boëdromion*. But this Objection being founded upon the Supposition of *Scaliger* concerning the *Athenian* Years, which has not met with an entire Approbation from those who are the most skilful in the *Græcian* Antiquities; we cannot agree in this Point with *Scaliger's* Opinion, who assigns the Month of *October* for the Battle of *Marathon*. But it seems very improbable, that the *Persians* not used to the Rigour of the Winter Season, should have chosen the Month of *October* for so great an Expedition, before the Month of *Boëdromion*, which is accounted among the Summer Months by the *Athenians*.

(o) Orat. 32. (p) Differt. 14.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXVII.

Of the Expedition or Deſcent of Xerxes *into* Greece, *and the Epocha of the Battel of* Salamis.

1. Xerxes *the Son of* Darius, *to revenge the Diſgrace received by his Father at* Marathon, *reſolved to proſecute the War begun in his Father's time againſt* Greece: *For which purpoſe after vaſt Preparations made for five years together, he began his Expedition againſt* Greece *in the ſixth year, according to* (a) Juſtin.
2. Xerxes, *after he had conquered* Egypt, *of which he had made his Brother* Achamenes *Governour, invaded* Greece *at the Inſtigation of* Mardonius, *according to* (b) Herodotus.
3. *This Deſcent was made on the ſame year that* Calliades *was* Archon *at* Athens, *according to* Herodotus, Dionyſius Halicarnaſſæus, *and* Diodorus Siculus.
4. *It was made in the ſame year that the* 75*th Olympiad was celebrated among the* Eleans, *where* Aſſylus *of* Syracuſa *won the Race, according to* Diodorus Siculus.
5. *It hapned in the year* 297. *after the firſt Olympiad, according to the Teſtimony of* Eratoſthenes *in* Clemens Alexandrinus.
6. *Beſides, that total Eclipſe of the* Sun *which hapned in the ſame year that* Xerxes *began his Expedition againſt* Greece, (c) *and was obſerved by the* Perſians *in the Spring, as they*

(a) Lib. 2. c. 10. (b) Lib. 7. (c) Herod. L. 7.

were

were ready to break up from Sardis: There hapned also another Eclipse of the Sun, which being observ'd by Cleombrotus as he was performing his Sacrifice, he returned with those Forces that were sent to post themselves in the Isthmus in Sparta (d).

7. The Battel of Salamis was fought ten years after that of Marathon, according to Plato, Thucydides, and Lysias.

8. The Defeat of the Persians near Salamis hapned in the same year that Cæsus Fabius and Sp. Fusius Furus were Consuls at Rome, according to Dionysius Halicarnassæus (e).

9. The Battel of Salamis was fought about the time that the Greeks solemnized their Feast called Mysteria; as may be gathered from (f) Herodotus.

10. The Day on which this Battle was fought, was the 20th day of the Month of Boëdromion, as has been observed in Plutarch, cited in the foregoing Chapter.

From whence may be concluded, that the Battle of Salamis hapned in the year of the Julian Period 4234. Cycle C. 16. D. 16. in Autumn; and that Xerxes made his Descent in the Spring.

To investigate the Year since the beginning of this Epocha.

If therefore from any one given of the Julian Period be subtracted 4233 years and eight Months, the Residue shews the year since the beginning of this Epocha: and if the said Sum be added to the year of this Epocha, the Product will be correspondent to the year of the Julian Period.

Of the vast Number of the Forces transported by Xerxes into Greece.

§. 1. THE Historians differ in their Relations concerning the Number of Forces which *Xerxes* transported into *Greece*; yet so

(d) Her. Lib. 9. (e) Lib. 9. (f) Lib. 8.

that according to the moſt modeſt Computation they allow them to have been 700000 at leaſt; whereas the moſt make them amount to an almoſt incredible Number. For *Herodotus* ſays the *Perſian* Army conſiſted of 2310007 Foot and 80000 Horſe, not comprehending the Servants and others that followed the Army. *Juſtin* ſays, *Xerxes* had brought together an Army of 700000 Men out of *Perſia*, beſides 300000 Auxiliaries; ſo that it was not without Reaſon ſaid from his Army, that they conſumed and dreined whole Rivers, and that all *Greece* was not big enough to contain them. (*g*) *Probus* makes his Army to conſiſt of 700000 Foot and 40000 Horſe; and (*h*) *Lyſias* repreſents the Number of the *Perſians* tranſported into *Greece* by *Xerxes* as incredible. This Expedition therefore having been of ſuch an extraordinary Moment, and the Defeat of ſo vaſt an Army proportionable to the Greatneſs of the Enterprize, what wonder if this was look'd upon as one of the moſt memorable Epocha's in the ancient times.

The moſt memorable Engagements betwixt the Perſians *and* Greeks.

§. 1. The firſt Engagement after the Deſcent made by *Xerxes* in *Greece*, betwixt the *Greeks* and *Perſians*, happened at *Thermopylæ*, where *Leonidas* the *Spartan* General and King did encounter the whole Force of *Aſia*; and notwithſtanding he was foretold by the Oracle that he ſhould loſe the Day, he animated his Soldiers in the following Words: *Lads, Fellow-Soldiers, dine as if we were to ſup together in the other World.* *Leonidas* was ſlain in the Engagement by the Perfidy of the Inhabitants of the Place, who had betrayed the Avenues and Paſſages to the Enemy; but the *Perſians* did not purchaſe this Victory without the Loſs of 20000 Men on their ſide. The Tombs of the *Lacedæmonians* were adorned with

(*g*) Vit. Themiſt. (*h*) Or. t. 31.

the

the following Epigram of *Simonides*, as it is to be found in *Latin* in (*k*) *Cicero*.

Dic, hospes, Spartæ, nos te hic vidisse jacentes,
Dum sanctis patriæ legibus obsequimur.

The next Encounter hapned near *Artemisium*, where both Parties having fought with almost equal Fortune, the *Greeks*, under Conduct of *Themistocles*, drew the *Persians* into the Streights of *Salamis*, where they were entirely routed. Notwithstanding which, the *Greeks* and *Persians* came to another Engagement in the next following year near *Platææ*, a City of *Bœotia*, where *Mardonius* at the Head of an Army of 200000 Foot and 10000 Horse, was slain in the Field, with a great Number of *Persians*, as may be seen more at large in (*l*) *Herodotus*, in (*m*) *Diodorus Siculus*, in (*n*) *Strabo* and *Pausanias*. On the same day hapned that memorable Sea-Fight betwixt the *Greeks* and *Persians* near *Mycale*, wherein the first were likewise victorious; after which the *Persians* were so far from being able to recover their Loss, that they were forced in their Camp; and afterwards *Xerxes* and his Successours lost all the strong Holds they were possessed of in those Parts.

§. 3. After which unfortunate Battel of *Salamis*, *Xerxes* sought his own Safety in a most ignominious Flight, leaving so vast an Army without a Head: And he, who had covered the Sea not long before with his Fleet, now satisfied himself with a small Fisher-Boat; which, after it had been for some time tossed up and down by the tempestuous Weather, at last conveyed him to the *Asiatick* Shoar; where being despised by his Subjects, he was unfortunately murthered by *Arbanus*. *The Flight of Xerxes.*

(*l*) Tusc. quæst. l. 1. (*k*) l. 9. (*m*) l. 11. c. l. 9. (*n*) In Lacon.

Whether Xerxes *is the same with* Ahasuerus.

§. 4. *Scaliger* is of Opinion that this *Xerxes*, who by his unfortunate Expedition into *Greece*, has given the Name to this Epocha, was the same with *Ahasuerus*, who is mentioned to have espoused *Esther* in the Holy Scripture. It must be confess'd that some Objections may be made against this Assertion: But thus much is certain on the other hand, that it is not destitute of a great Probability: For, not to insist upon the Affinity of the Word *Oxyares* (which was the Name of *Xerxes* before he came to the Crown) the great Character given of the Power of *Ahasuerus* is most suitable to *Xerxes*. For tho' the *Persian* Monarchs, both before and after the Reign of *Xerxes*, were Masters of many great Provinces, yet there is scarce any of them since *Xerxes*, who could boast that the Limits of his Empire extended from the *Indies* to *Æthiopia*; and that none of the Predecessours of *Xerxes* could pretend to that Glory, seems to be manifest out of the Oration of *Mardonius* the General of *Xerxes*; whose Words spoken to the Soldiery are thus related by *Herodotus*: *It would be very unbecoming to us, who have conquer'd the* Saca's, Indians, Æthiopians *and* Assyrians, *out of no other Motive than the Desire of extending our Conquests, should let the* Greeks, *who have been the first Aggressors, go off unreveng'd.* And if we inspect the Catalogue of the *Persian* Kings as mention'd by *Esdra*, and how congruous it is to our Opinion, I cannot but wonder how the same should have been so little regarded by those, who elsewhere appear so zealous in maintaining their Opinions out of the Scripture against the Chronologers. Those who would have *Ahasuerus* to be the same with *Artaxerxes Longimanus*, are very well censured by *Christianus Adamus Ruperti*: *Such*, says he, *as make* Artaxerxes Longimanus *the Spouse of* Esther, *have not rightly compared the Holy Scripture with the ancient Monuments of Prophane History. Unless we be,* (concludes

cludes he) *quite unacquainted with the Book of* Esther *and* Esdra, *we must confess that* Ahasuerus *was the same with* Xerxes: *For he is expressly put before* Artaxerxes I. *and* Darius Nothus.

CHAP. XXVIII.

Of the Epocha of the Peloponnesian *WAR.*

1. Thucydides (*a*) *in his Commentary of this most famous War, lays down the Characters of this Epocha; among which are two Eclipses of the Sun and one of the Moon: The first Eclipse of the Sun he makes coincident with the Summer of the same year when the* Peloponnesian *War began.* Plutarch (*b*) *and* Valerius Maximus *make likewise mention of this Eclipse.*
2. *The* 2*d Eclipse of the Sun* Thucydides (*c*) *makes coincident with the beginning of the* 8*th year of the* Peloponnesian *War.*
3. *The* 3*d Eclipse being in the Moon,* Thucidides (*d*) *makes coincident with the* 19*th year of the* Peloponnesian *War* (*e*).
4. *According to the Testimony of the same Author, the* Peloponnesian *War began in the same year that* Pythodorus *was* Archon *at* Athens, *and* Æneſias Ephorus *of* Sparta; *yet so, that the first, after two Months from the Beginning of this War was succeeded by* Euthydemus, *as the last was by* Brasidas: *So that the greatest part of their annual Government being coincident with the first year of this Epocha, its Origen is commonly deduced*

(*a*) Lib. 2. (*b*) In vit. Pericl (*c*) L. 4. (*d*) L. 2. (*e*) L. 2.

from the time of the Magistracy of these two last.

5. *The first year of the 86th Olympiad when* Lysimachus *was* Archon *at* Athens, *and* Isocrates *was born, was the fifth year before the* Peloponnesian *War, according to* Dionysius, Plutarch, *and* Laërtius.

6. *The 18th year of the* Peloponnesian *War was coincident with the same Olympiad when* Crocinus *of* Thessalia *won the Race; and when* Eudius *or* Eudicus *was* Ephorus *at* Sparta, *and* Pythodorus *Archon at* Athens: *And in the same year happned the Eclipse of the Sun, which, by the Astronomical Calculation has been found to have been in the year of the* Julian *Period* 4310, *on the third Day of September, according to* (*f*) Xenophon.

7. *The* Peloponnesian *War began with the Spring according to* Thucydides, L. 2.

From these and other Characters too many to be inserted here, we conclude that the Peloponnesian *War began in the year of the* Julian *Period* 4283, *in the Spring, Cycle* ☉. 27. ☽. 8.

To find out the year since the Beginning of this Epocha.

If therefore from any certain year of the Julian *Period be subtracted* 4282 *years and* 3 *months, the Residue shews the year since the beginning of the* Peloponnesian *War: And if the same Sum be added to the said year of this Epocha, the Product must be correspondent to the year of the* Julian *Period.*

The Occasion of the Peloponnesian *War.*

§. 1. IT is very well worth Observation what (*g*) *Diodorus Siculus* and (*h*) *Valerius Maximus* relate concerning the Occasion of this War. For *Pericles* a Man of great Authority among the *Athenians*, having converted a vast Sum of Money which was given by the *Athenians* to re-

(*f*) L. 2 Rer. Græc. (*g*) Bibl. *l.* 12. (*h*) L. 3. c. 3.

build

build the Caſtle of *Athens*, to his own Uſe, and finding himſelf not in a Capacity to give an Account of it to his Fellow-Citizens, appeared one day very melancholy at home. *Alcibiades* being then but a Youth, perceiving him to be more than ordinary penſive, ask'd him what made him look ſo much concern'd? Unto which *Pericles* anſwering, becauſe he did not know how to make up his Accounts. *Alcibiades* reply'd, then you have nothing elſe to do, but to find out a way not to be accountable at all. *Pericles* taking the Hint, from that day found Means to perſuade the *Athenians* to begin this War, imagining that thereby they would be prevented from calling him to an Account.

Who were concerned on both ſides in this War.

§. 2. And tho' this War be commonly called the *Peloponneſian* War, yet were not the *Peloponneſians* and *Athenians* alone concerned in it, but all *Greece*. On the ſide of the *Peloponneſians* were the *Lacedæmonians*, whoſe General was *Archidamus*, the *Megarians*, *Locrians*, *Phocenſes*, *Ambracioti*, *Lucadians*, the *Bœotians*, *Corinthiani*, and *Syconians*. The *Athenians* had for their Confederates the *Chii*, *Lesbii*, the *Platæenſes*, *Meſſenii*, *Caria*, *Acarnanes*, *Corcyrei*, *Zacynthii*, *Cyclades*, beſides thoſe of *Ionia*, *Helleſpont* and *Thracia*, who were Tributaries to the *Athenians*. See *Pauſanias* *.

How long the Peloponneſian War laſted.

§. 3. (*i*) *Xenophon* allots 28 years and 6 months for the *Peloponneſian* War; but *Dionyſius Petavius* has very well obſerved that *Xenophon* has made an Addition of one year, there being no more than 27 years and 6 months to be accounted from the Spring of the 4283d year of the *Julian* Period when this War begun, till the Autumn of the 4310th year of the *Julian* Period when it was ended, and was rendred remarkable by a notable Eclipſe of the Suns: both the Beginning and the

* In Lacon. (*i*) Ad Rch. Grac.

End of this War, being illuſtrious by two Eclipſes of the ſame. In the 10th year of this War the *Greeks*, as *Thucydides* relates, made a Truce which was very ill obſerved.

The Names of the Athenian Archontes, *and* Lacedemonian Ephori *during this War.*

§. 4. The annual Magiſtracy of the Archontes at *Athens*, and of the *Lacedæmonian Ephori*, having both their Beginning about the time of the Æſtival Solſtice, and the Names of the ſeveral *Archontes* and *Ephori* being look'd upon as ſo many Characters in the Hiſtory of this War, we have for the more Perſpicuity's ſake, inſerted their Names in the following Catalogue, each in his due Order, with an Addition of each year of the *Julian* Period, when theſe *Archontes* and *Ephori* began their Magiſtracy being about the time of the Summer Solſtice.

Ann. Bell.	*Archontes.*	*Ephori.*	*An. Pe. jul.*
I.	Pythodorus,	Æneſias.	4282
II.	Euthydemus.	Braſidas.	4283
III.	Apollodorus.	Iſanor.	4284
IV.	Epaminon.	Softratidas.	4285
V.	Diotimus.	Exarchus.	4286
VI.	Euclides.	Ageſiſtratus.	4287
VII.	Euthydemus.	Angenidas.	4288
VIII.	Stratocles.	Onomacles.	4289
IX.	Iſarchus.	Zeuxippus.	4290
X.	Aminias.	Pityas.	4291
XI.	Alcæus.	Phiſtolas.	4292
XII.	Ariſtion.	Clinomach.	4293
XIII.	Aſtyphilius.	Ilarchus.	4294
XIV.	Archias.	Leon.	4295
XV.	Antiphon.	Chæridas.	4296
XVI.	Euphemus.	Pateſiades.	4297
XVII.	Ariſtomneſtus.	Cleoſthenes.	4298
XVIII.	Chabrias.	Lycarius.	4299
XIX.	Piſander.	Eperatus.	4300
XX.	Cleocritus.	Onomantius.	4301
XXI.	Callias.	Alexippidas.	4302
XXII.	Glalicippus.	Theopomp.	4303

XXIII.

An. Bel.	*Archontes.*	*Ephori.*	*An. Pe. Jul.*
XXIII.	Glaucippus.	Iſias.	4304
XXIV.	Diocles.	Aracus.	4305
XXV.	Euctemon.	Evarchippus.	4306
XXVI.	Antigenes.	Pantacles.	4307
XXVII.	Callias.	Pityas.	4308
XXVIII.	Alexias.	Archytas.	4309
XXIX.	Pythodorus.	Eudicus.	4310

CHAP. XXIX.

Of the Epocha and Interval of the Seventy Weeks of Daniel *mentioned in the 9th Chapter, Verſe 24.*

1. *By theſe 70 Weeks are to be underſtood annual Weeks, or an Interval of* 490 *years.*
2. *During this Interval of Years the Meſſias was born, and ſuffered Death, Verſ.* 24.
3. *The beginning of this Epocha is to be fixed to that time when that ſolemn Edict of rebuilding the City of* Jeruſalem *was made.*
4. *The End of theſe 70 annual Weeks ought to be coincident with the time of the total Deſtruction of that City, according to the Words in* (*a*) Daniel, Seventy Weeks are determined upon thy People, and upon thy holy City; *and the Words of* (*b*) *St.* Matthew, When you ſhall ſee the Abomination of Deſolation ſtand in the holy Place.
5. *From the beginning of this Interval or Epocha, till the* 32*d year of the Reign of* Artaxerxes

(*a*) C. 9. v. (*b*) C. 24. v. 15.

Mne-

Mnemon, *when* Nehemiah *returned out of* Perſia, *ought to be accounted* 7 *annual Weeks or* 49 (*c*) *Years*, Dan. 9. v. 25.

6. Scaliger's *Opinion ſeems to be not improbable, that the firſt year of theſe* 70 *Annual Weeks was likewiſe the firſt both in the Sacred, Sabbatic, and Jubilean Cycle: For the Angel calls them expreſly* Annual Weeks, *which are equivalent to the Sabbatick Cycle, and all together make up the Interval of* 490 *Years, or* 10 *Jubilean Cycles. And what has been ſaid of the firſt year of the myſtical Interval, may likewiſe be applied to the laſt Year.*

From whence Scaliger *and his Followers conclude, that the firſt year of the* 70 *Weeks of* Daniel *was coincident with the* 4292*d year of the* Julian *Period; and that the laſt year was coincident with the* 4782*d year of the ſame* Julian *Period.*

To inveſtigate the year ſince the beginning of this Epocha.

If therefore 4292 *years be ſubtracted from any certain year of the* Julian *Period, the Reſidue ſhews the year ſince the beginning of this Interval of* 70 *Annual Weeks. And if the ſaid Sum be added to the year of this Epocha, or Interval, the Product will be correſpondent to the year of the* Julian *Period.*

Whether it be poſſible to find out the time determined by the 70 *Weeks.*

§. 1. NOT only the *Jews* look upon the Determination of the time mentioned by *Daniel* in theſe 70 Weeks as impoſſible; but alſo not a few among the Chriſtians, conſider the ſame as intangled in almoſt inſurmountable Difficulties. (*d*) *Origen Adamantius* in his Explication upon theſe Words of Chriſt in St. *Matthew* c. 24. *When ye ſhall ſee the Abomination of Deſolation ſtand in the holy Places*, makes uſe of the following Expreſſion: *It belongs only to* Daniel *and*

(*c*) Nehem. 13. v. 6. (*d*) Homil. 32.

ſuch

Holy Men (as were endowed with the Holy Ghost) to give the right Interpretation of those Words, and what is meant by the Abomination of the Desolation. St. *Austin* was of the same Opinion, and could never be prevailed upon to determine any thing concerning these 70 Weeks; as may be seen out of his 80th Epistle written to *Hesychius*. In like manner, says St. *Jerome*, *I know that the Learned are divided in their Opinions about this Question, every one judging according to the best of his Understanding.* And because it is dangerous to give a positive Judgment concerning the different Opinions of so many learned Men in the Church, and to prefer the Sentiments of some before the others, I will be contented to rehearse only the several Opinions, leaving it to the Judgment of the Reader to follow Footsteps he will be pleased to follow. The *English* Interpreters of the Bible, especially such who have made their Animadversions upon the new Translation, follow S. *Jerom*'s Example, rehearsing only the Opinions of others, without deciding any thing in the matter. The *Dutch* are somewhat inclining to the Opinion of *Berosus* in their marginal Notes upon the Bible follow the same Rule, as may be seen out of the following Words: *Unto what time the Beginning and End of these* 490 *years is to be fixed, is a great Dispute: Some begin them with the Reign of the Monarchy of* Cyrus, *and would have them end with the Death of Christ, which seems to be the plainest of all, according to* Isaiah c. 44. v. 28. and c. 45. v. 13. 2 Chron. c. 36. v. 22, 23. Ezra c. 1. v. 1. *Others make the Beginning of them coincident with the 7th year of the Reign of* Artaxerxes Longimanus, *and their End likewise with the Death of Christ. Others begin from the 20th year of the Reign of* Darius Nothus, *and end*

[a] Tom. V. Oper.

with

with the Deſtruction of Jeruſalem. *All which we leave to the Determination of the Reader.* But among all others, the Hypotheſis of *Reinoldus* puts the Determination of this Prophecy beyond all Poſſibility, when, the better to palliate his erroneous Opinion, that theſe 490 years ought to begin from *Cyrus* and end with the *Meſſias*, he inſinuates, that by theſe LXX Weeks there was not intended any certain determined time: but in a ſenſe uſual in the Scripture, a certain Number was ſet for an uncertain. It is undeniable that the Calculation founded upon this Prophecy concerning the 70 Weeks, is involved in no ſmall Difficulties; nevertheleſs, not ſuch as are impoſſible to be ſurmounted. For elſe it had been ſpoken in vain by the Angel, *KNOW THEREFORE AND UNDERSTAND*, if it had been beyond all poſſibility of being comprehended by Mortal Men: And what Benefit could be ſuppoſed to accrue to Mankind from ſuch Words as were altogether incomprehenſible by Human Underſtanding. As it is beyond all Diſpute, that the Event renders Prophecies more perſpicuous; ſo it is in this caſe, that ſince the time prefixed by the Angel is expired long ago, the Event it ſelf has in a great meaſure illuſtrated the Words of this Prophecy; ſo that we need not deſpair of its Interpretation. And ſince it is evident, that the Angel expreſly mentions both the Beginning and End of theſe 70 Weeks, the Hypotheſis of *Reinoldus* ought to be rejected, as directly oppoſite to the Words of the Holy Scripture.

Concerning the Interval of 7 Weeks mentioned by the Angel.

§. 2. Among the Chriſtian Interpreters, (*f*) *Origen* underſtands by each of the Angelical Weeks ſeven times ten Years: So that the whole Number of theſe 70 Weeks makes up 4900

(*f*) Hom. 29. in Matth.

years.

years. He fixes their beginning to the Creation of *Adam*, and their end to the Deſtruction of the ſecond Temple. There are alſo ſome among the *Jews* who interpret theſe 70 Weeks of ſo many *Jubilean* Cycles, and conſequently make up their whole Number 3430 years. But both theſe Opinions are ſo abſurd and founded upon Suppoſitions contrary to the Phraſe of the Scripture and the Nature of this Interval, that there are but very few who have eſpouſed either of theſe Opinions: For two ſorts of Weeks are only mentioned in the Scripture: The firſt is the Week conſiſting of ſeven Days; on the laſt of which, to wit, the ſeventh *Feria*, the *Jews* were commanded to reſt from their ordinary Employments in memory of the ſeventh day when God reſted after the Creation of the Univerſe. And beſides theſe Weeks conſiſting of 7 Days, we alſo find in the holy Scripture Annual Weeks, each of which are equivalent to 7 years. Of theſe *Moſes* makes mention in (g) *Leviticus*; *And thou ſhalt number ſeven Sabbaths of years unto thee, ſeven times ſeven years, and the ſpace of the ſeven Sabbaths of years ſhall be unto thee forty and nine years.* It is no very difficult Matter to determine which of theſe two ſorts of Weeks is to be underſtood in this Prophecy; it being evident, that ſince the Prediction of the Angel was made in reſpect of a thing that was to happen not till a conſiderable time after, theſe 70 Weeks, could not be underſtood of the Common Ones, but of Annual Weeks: For it is ſaid, that in the Space of 7 Weeks the City was to be rebuilt; which certainly could not be done in 49 Days or 7 Weeks time. And the Event it ſelf (the beſt Interpreter of Prophecies) has convinc'd us, that the Edict of rebuilding the

(g) Cap. 25. ver. 8.

City

City, the Appearing of the *Messias*, and the total Destruction of the City did not happen till 490 years after, which was the exact time of 70 Weeks foretold by the Angel. From whence it plainly appears that the Weeks mentioned in *Daniel* were Annual Weeks, each of which contained the Space of 7 Years and the whole Interval of 70 Weeks 490 Years. Most of the *Jewish* Interpreters themselves are forced to agree in this Point with us, that the Angel intended by these 70 Weeks 490 Years; tho' they differ from us, both in the Beginning and End of this Interval. (*h*) *Menasseh Ben Israel* says expressly, *The 70 Weeks of* Daniel *make up* 490 *Years*. And to the same Purpose (*i*) *Rab. Isaac Abarbinel* expresses himself, as also *Rabbi Joseph Jacchias*, and *Rabbi Aben Ezra*, and many more.

Whether these 490 years consisted of Lunar Years.

§. 3. *Julius Africanus* who is supposed to have been the first among the Christians that traced the Chronology of the holy Scripture. *Eusebius* (according to the Opinion of *Scaliger* and *Gerhardus Johannes Vossius*) having transcribed out of his Works entire Pages in his Chronology. This *Africanus* and after him *Theodoretus*, with several others, are of Opinion that these 490 years are to be understood of Lunar Years, which make 475 Solar Years. *Dionysius Carthusianus*, who (according to *Rob. Bellarmine*) flourished about the year of Christ 1450) affirms that this Opinion was received in the Scholastick History, and by those Doctors of the Church that profess themselves Followers of *Beda*. But these Interpreters have been misguided by the Word נחך which, not only in the vulgar Translation, but also in the time of *Tertullian*, has been translated *are abbreviated*: For *Tertullian* in his Book written against

(*h*) Term. vit. hum. p. 68. (*i*) Comment. in Dan.

the

the *Jews* in the Chapter of the Paſſion of Chriſt and the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, cites the Words of the Angel in the following manner: *Seventy Weeks are abbreviated upon thy People, and upon thy Holy City, to finiſh the Tranſgreſſion and to make an End of Sins, and to make Reconciliation for Iniquities, and to bring in everlaſting Righteouſneſs*; Which has miſguided theſe Interpreters into this Error, That not the common Years, but ſuch as are ſhorter than the reſt, ought to be underſtood in this Prediction: In which Sence *Carthuſianus* ſays: *Theſe Weeks are ſaid to be ſhortened, not ſo as to be leſſened in their Number, but in Quantity; becauſe the Lunar Year falls* 11 *Days ſhorter than the Solar Year.* But theſe Interpreters have miſſed the true Meaning of the Original Text, which does not imply ſo much a Shortening, Leſſening or Abbreviating, as the Determination of certain exact Intervals of time. So that it remains unqueſtionable that the Angel in this Prophecy did ſpeak of the Solar Years, and at the ſame time exactly determined the Beginning and the End of this Interval. See *Corn. à Lapide* upon this Paſſage.

Whether the beginning of this Interval is to be fixed to the time of that ſolemn Edict of rebuilding the City.

§. 4. That the Beginning of this Interval ought to be fixed to the time of that ſolemn Edict of rebuilding the holy City, appears moſt evidently from the Words of the Angel in (k) *Daniel, Know therefore and underſtand, that from the publiſhing of the Commandment to reſtore and to build* Jeruſalem, *&c.* according to the Tranſlation of *Junius* and *Tremellius*; or, *from the going forth of the Commandment*, as *Pagninus* and *Luther* have tranſlated it. And that thereby was intended the rebuilding of a City, which was formerly deſtroyed, is evident from the Words and the whole Scope of

(k) Cap. 9. v. 25.

the

the Prophetick Text, the Angel having ſpoken theſe Words as God's Anſwer to the Prayers of *Daniel*, which were as follows: *Now therefore, O our God, hear the Prayer of thy Servant, and his Supplications, and cauſe thy Face to ſhine upon thy Sanctuary, that is deſolate for the Lord's ſake.* I cannot therefore but be ſurprized to ſee ſome of the Fathers look for the Beginning of this Interval any where elſe than where it is fixed by the Angel; eſpecially what could move *Origen* to go back as far as *Adam*; and, as we have ſaid before, to make the Number of theſe Weeks amount to 4900 years. Thus (*m*) *Tertullian*, with ſeveral others of the Ancients, and among the modern Writers *Raymondus* and *Andreas Helvicus* would deduce its Origin, not from the time of this ſolemn Edict or Commandment, but from that time when God foretold the rebuilding of the Temple and City by the Prophet. But the *Jews* make themſelves moſt ridiculous in that, to invalidate the Arguments of the Chriſtians, by which they prove from this Prophecy, that the *Meſſias* is already come, they pretend to put this fictitious Computation upon the World, that the Weeks of *Daniel* ought to begin with the Deſtruction of the firſt, and end with the Deſtruction of the ſecond Temple; ſo that the 70 years of their Captivity, during which time the Temple remained deſolate, is to be added to 410 years, which, they ſay, is the time the 2d Temple has ſtood; as may be ſeen in their *Chron. Major.* in *Rabbi Iſaac Abarbinel*, *Rabbi Iſaac Ben Abraham*, and others of the ſame Stamp. This Opinion is contradictory to the expreſs Words of the Angel; That *from the going forth of the Commandment, to reſtore the City*, theſe 70 Weeks are to be computed. Beſides that, it is

(*l*) Cap. 9. v. 17. (*m*) Lib. contra Jud.

abſo-

abſolutely falſe that there is an Interval of 490 years betwixt the Deſtruction of the firſt and the ſecond Temple. For, as has been ſufficiently demonſtrated before (*n*), the Deſtruction of the firſt Temple happned in the Year of the *Julian* Period 4124; whereas the ſecond Temple was laid in Aſhes in the Year of the *Julian* Period 4783; ſo that the whole Interval amounts to no leſs than 659 years. It is alſo quite beyond the Purpoſe, when the *Jews* pretend to explain the Words of the Angel concerning the Meſſiah, of King *Cyrus*: For tho' we read in (*o*) *Iſaiah*, *Thus ſaid the Lord to his Anointed, to* Cyrus, no Inference is to be made from thence, that the Word *Meſſiah*, either by it ſelf, or with ſuch Attributes as occur in this Paſſage of *Daniel*, are ever applied in the Scripture to any Earthly Prince. See D. *Mulleri Judaiſm* c. 10. and *Conſtantini L'Empereur, Annotat. ad Jachiad.*

§. 5. We read of four ſeveral Edicts concerning the Reſtauration of the *Jews* and the Rebuilding of the Temple and City in the Holy Scripture. The firſt we meet with, is in (*p*) *Ezra*. 'In the firſt Year of *Cyrus* King of *Perſia* (that the Word of the Lord by the Mouth 'of *Jeremiah* might be fulfilled) the Lord ſtirred 'up the Spirit of *Cyrus* King of *Perſia*, that he 'made a Proclamation throughout all his King-'dom, and put it alſo in Writing, ſaying, Thus 'ſaid *Cyrus* King of *Perſia*, The Lord God of 'Heaven hath given me all the Kingdoms of the 'Earth, and he hath charged me to build him an 'Houſe at *Jeruſalem*, which is in *Judah*. Who 'is there among you of all his People? His 'God be with him, and let him go up to *Jeruſa-'lem* which is in *Judah*, and build the Houſe of 'the Lord God of *Iſrael*, (he is the God which

Four ſeveral Edicts concerning the Rebuilding of the City occur in the Scripture.

(*m*) Ch. 22. (*o*) C. 45. v. 1. (*p*) C. 1. v. 1.

is in *Jerusalem*, &c. The same Words we read also in the (q) *Chronicles*, pursuant to the Prophecy of (r) *Isaiah*. The second Mandate or Edict concerning this Restitution is describ'd likewise by (s) *Ezra*, which being sent by *Darius* in the same year that the Prophets *Haggai* and *Zechariah* began to prophesie to the Governours beyond the River, contains the following Words: 'Let the Work of this House of God alone: Let 'the Governour of the *Jews*, and the Elders of 'the *Jews* build this House of God in his Place. 'Also, I have made a Decree, that whosoever shall alter this Word, let Timber be pulled 'down from his House, and being set up, let him 'be hanged thereon, and let his House be made 'a Dunghil for this; And the God that hath caused his Name to dwel there, destroy all Kings 'and People that shall put to their Hand to alter 'and to destroy this House of God which is at 'Jerusalem. I *Darius* have made a Decree; let 'it be done with speed. And the Prophecies of *Haggai* and *Zechariah* cited by *Ezra*, mention expressly the second Year of *Darius*, and the Month. For thus we read in *Haggai*, Chap. 1. v. 1. *&seq.* 'In the second Year of *Darius* the King, in the 'sixth Month, in the first Day of the Month, 'came the Word of the Lord by *Haggai* the 'Prophet unto *Zerubbabel* the Son of *Shealtiel*, 'Governour of *Judah*, and to *Joshua* the Son of 'Josedech the High Priest, saying, thus saith the 'Lord of Hosts, &c. Go up to the Mountain and 'bring Wood, and build the House, and I will 'take Pleasure in it, and I will be glorified, said the 'Lord. The same Mandate is repeated by (t) *Zachariah* in the eighth Month of the same second Year of *Darius*; when, pursuant to God's Command ment, and the Decree of the *Persian*

(q) C. 6. v. 2. 23. (r) C. 49. (s) C. 6. v. 7. 11. 12. (t) C. 1. v. 1.

King, the Work was happily brought to Perfection, according to the Words of *Ezra* (*u*): 'And 'this House was finished on the third Day of 'the Month *Adar*, which was in the sixth year of 'the Reign of *Darius* the King: And the Chil'dren of *Israel*, the Priests, and the Levites, and 'the rest of the Children of the Captivity, kept 'the Dedication of this House with Joy. The third Edict is likewise described by (*x*) *Ezra*. 'This *Ezra* went up from *Babylon*; and the King 'granted him all his Request, according to the 'Hand of the Lord his God upon him. And 'there went up some of the Children of 'Israel, and of the Priests, and the Levites, and 'the Singers, and the Porters, and the *Nethinims*, 'unto *Jerusalem* in the 7th year of *Artaxerxes* 'the King. And he came to *Jerusalem* in the 5th 'Month, which was in the 7th Year of the King. This Decree of King *Artaxerxes* grants full Liberty to the *Jews* to return to *Jerusalem*, and exempts all the Priests, Levites and other Ministers of the House of God from Toll, Tribute or Custom. The fourth Edict concerned particularly *Nehemiah* (*y*), who in the 20th year of King *Artaxerxes* got leave to go to *Jerusalem* with the King's Letter to the Governours beyond the River, and unto *Asaph* the Keeper of the King's Forests, that he should give the *Jews Timber to make Beams for the Gates of the Palace, which appertaineth to the House, and for the Wall of the City, and for the House he was* to enter into, as may be seen more at large in *Nehemiah*, Chap. 2. from the 1st to the 9th Verse. And these are the four several Mandates concerning the Restauration of the *Jews*, and the Rebuilding of the Temple and City; unto one of which, the Beginning of these 70 Weeks must

(*u*) C. 6. v. 15, 16. (*x*) C. 7. v. 6. *seqq.* (*y*) Ezr. 7. v. 13. 24.

be fixed. For the better understanding of the different Opinions of the Chronologers concerning the Time and Reigns of these Kings, unto whom the said Mandates are ascribed, we have given you in the following Table a Catalogue of the *Persian* Kings, according to the Computation of *Ptolemy*, the Manuscript of which was first found at *London* in *England*; and from thence sent over into *Germany* by Mr. *Overall*. We have added the years of the *Julian* Period, and all those Passages in the holy Scripture, where mention is made (according to our Opinion) of these Kings:

	An. Reg.	*In. Per. Jul.*	
Cyrus,	9	4176	Ezr. c. 1. v. 1.
Cambyses,	8	4185	Dan. c. 11. v. 2.
Magus & Darius Hystaspis,	36	4193	Dan. c. 11. v. 2.
Xerxes I.	21	4229	Dan. c. 11. v. 2. Ezr. c. 4. v. 6. Est. c. 1. v. 1.
Artaxerxes I. ît. Longimanus,	41	4250	Ezr. c. 4. v. 7.
Darius II. sive Nothus,	19	4291	Ezr. c. 4. v. 24. c. 6. v. 12. Hag. c. 1. v. 1. Zec. c. 1. v. 1.
Artaxerxes II. *or* Mnemon	46	4310	Ezr. c. 7. v. 1. 12. Neh. c. 2. v. 1.
Ochus,	21	4356	
Arsus, *or* Arses,	2	4377	
Darius III. *or* Codomannus	4	4379	Neh. c. 12. v. 22.

§. 6.

§. 6. There are not a few both among the Ancient and Modern Interpreters, who would have this Epocha of the 70 Weeks begin from the time of the Edict of *Cyrus*, of which mention is made by (*z*) *Ezra*, and in the (*a*) *Chronicles*. Among the Ancients, *Clemens* of *Alexandria* patronizes this Opinion before all others; and of the Modern Authors, *David Pareus*, *Conſtantine L'Empereur*, and (*b*) *Johannes Wichmannus*, eſpecially (*c*) *Matthæus Beroaldus* and *Beroaldus Broughton* an *Engliſhman*; unto which Opinion alſo the *Dutch* Interpreters ſeem to incline, as appears out of their Original Annotations heretofore mentioned, but without any Probability of Truth. For firſt, the Prophecy mentions ſuch a Decree as was to be put in Execution from the very beginning of theſe 70 Weeks; And it is evident that the Mandate of *Cyrus* did not take immediately the intended Effect, as may be ſeen in (*d*) *Ezra*, when he ſays, 'The People of the Land 'weakened the Hands of the People of *Judah*, 'and troubled them in building, and hired 'Councellours againſt them to fruſtrate their 'Purpoſe all the Days of *Cyrus* King of *Perſia*, 'even unto the Reign of *Darius*, King of *Perſia*. It was 2dly, foretold by the Angel, that the Streets and the Walls of the City were to be built again in the ſpace of the 7 firſt Weeks, which, it is evident, was not accompliſhed in 49 years after the Edict of *Cyrus*; for tho' we ſhould allow never ſo many years to the Reign of *Cyrus* after the Solution of the *Babylonian* Captivity, it will nevertheleſs be impoſſible to make the Time when *Nehemiah* finiſh'd the Walls in the 32d year of the Reign of *Artaxerxes* fall within the Compaſs of ſeven Annual Weeks, or 49

Whether the Beginning of this Epocha ought to be fixed to the time of the Solution of the Babylonian *Captivity.*

(*z*) C. 1. v. 1. ſequ. (*a*) 2 Chr. c. 36. v. 23. (*b*) Chr Sacr. p. 183. (*c*) Chr. l. 3. c. 7. (*d*) C. 4. v. 4, 5.

Years. See *Nehemiah* c. 13. v. 6. 3dly, The whole Structure of *Beroaldus*'s Artificial Hypothesis is built upon a very weak Foundation; to wit, that the End of these 70 Weeks is to be compleated with the Death of Christ, contrary to the Intention of the Angel, when he says of this Interval, 'Seventy Weeks are 'determined upon thy People, and upon 'thy Holy City.' 4thly, Unless we will positively contradict all the *Persian*, *Greek* and *Roman* Annals, it is impossible to reduce the Interval from *Cyrus* till the Passion of Christ to 490 years. For, supposing with *Beroaldus*, that Christ suffered in the 33d year of his Age, in the 4th year of the 202d Olympiad, in the year 784 from the Building of the City of *Rome*, in the 18th year of the Reign of *Tiberius*, in the year of the World 3961. Supposing I say, that according to the Synchronisms of *Beroaldus*, Christ suffered in the year of the *Julian* Period 4745, the Beginning of these 70 Weeks, and (according to the Hypothesis of *Beroaldus*) the Solution of the *Babylonian* Captivity of the *Jews* must be coincident with the year of the *Julian* Period 4255, when *Cyrus* was dead, long before the Interval from the Beginning of the *Babylonian* Epocha of *Cyrus* till the 18th year of the Reign of the Emperour *Tiberius*, comprehending no less than 569 years, as most evidently appears out of the following Table:

Accord-

According to the Computation of Ptolemy, *strengthened by innumerable Chronological Characters it appears that,*

	Years.
Cyrus reigned	9
Cambyses reigned	8
Darius I. reigned	36
Xerxes reigned	21
Artaxerxes I. reigned	41
Darius II. reigned	19
Artaxerxes II. reigned	46
Ochus reigned	23
Arostis reigned	2
Darius III. reigned	4
Alexander the Great reigned	8
Philippus Aridæus reigned	7
Alexander reigned	12
Ptolemæus Lagi reigned	20
Ptolemæus Philadelphus reigned	38
Evergetes reigned	25
Philopator reigned	17
Epiphanius reigned	24
Philometor reigned	35
Evergetes II. reigned	29
Soter reigned	36
Dionysius reigned	29
Cleopatra reigned	22
Augustus reigned	43
Tiberius reigned	17
Sum	569

Some reject the Authority of the ancient Historians concerning the Persian *Monarchs.*

§. 7. Those who pretend to fix the Beginning of these 70 Annual Weeks to the first year of *Cyrus*, and their End to the time of the Passion of Christ, make use of this Method, that they reject the Authority of all the most ancient prophane History, and allow of no other *Persian* Kings but what are mentioned in the Sacred History of these Times. (e) *Beroaldus* says thus: 'Both our Modern and Ancient Prophane Historians are ignorant of the time of the *Persian* 'Monarchy, or how many Kings swayed the 'Sceptre over that vast Empire, as is very evident 'from their various and dubious Relations. But 'we that are informed by the Holy Scripture 'concerning the first *Persian* Monarchs, and know 'the rest out of the Ancient Monuments of 'Prophane History are in a better Capacity to 'give a solid Judgment of these Times than 'ever could be expected from *Herodotus*, *Josephus*, *Manetho*, *Metasthenes*, or *Ctesias*, upon whose 'Authority the most rely upon in the History of 'these Times. And there are others also who are more rigorous in their Judgment, in not allowing the Ancient Monuments of Prophane History the least Certainty as to this Point, and denying every thing that is not expressly mention'd concerning these Monarchs in the Sacred History. We don't in the least blame these Authors for extolling and maintaining the Authority of the Sacred History, but judge it more safe to keep the middle Way: For, it would be of very ill Consequence under the specious Pretence of a pious Intention to reject such things as have been received by the joint Consent of most Historians and Chronologers, and to call in question the whole Histories of those Historians who

(e) Lib. 3. cap. 8.

lived

lived next to these times, to wit, *Herodotus*, *Thucydides*, *Xenophon*, *Ctesias*, *Cnidius*, (whose Monuments are transmitted to Posterity, and remaining to this day) or *Theopompus*, *Ephorus*, *Timæus*, *Callisthenes* (whose Works are lost, but the Remnants of them to be found in (*f*) *Diodorus Siculus*.) Besides that, the Reigns of these antient *Persian* Monarchs are rendred illustrious to Posterity by many Celestial Characters, as may be seen in (*g*) *Ptolemy*. As to what relates to that Argument, that no other of the *Persian* Monarchs are to be allow'd of, but such as are mentioned in the Scripture. (*h*) *Ubbo Emmius* has very well answered *Hugo Broughton* (who patronizes the same Opinion) in the following Words: 'To prove their Hypothesis, they alledge, that only these Kings are named by *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*, and therefore the rest mention'd in Prophane History ought to be considered as suppositions. If this way of arguing be allowable, I see no Reason why it may not be said with the same Right: The Books of the Kings and the Chronicles mention only five *Assyrian* Kings, to wit, *Pul*, *Theglathalasar*, *Salmanassar*, *Sennacherib*, *Asarhaddon* (for *Merodach*, *Naburhodonosor*, *Balthazar*, and *Evilmerodach* were *Chaldæans*, not *Assyrians*) therefore no other Kings have ruled over *Assyria*. And thus we might proceed to the Kings of *Syria* and *Egypt*. Can any thing be more weak or more vain? For what is more evident than that in the History of one particular Nation no further mention used to be made of the Kings of the Neighbouring Nations than is requisite for the explaining or perfecting their Relations; and that a whole Catalogue or Series of the Kings of any Nation is not to be look'd for, but in the particular History of that Nation

(*f*) Biblioth. (*g*) Almagest. l. 5. c. 14. (*h*) Chron. l. 2. p. 58.

the

the Author intends to treat of. Of which, to say more would be superfluous, &c.

§. 8. One of the main Questions, and the most difficult to be resolved belonging to this Point, is, which of the three *Darius*'s is to be understood by that *Darius* mentioned by *Haggai*, *Zechariah* and *Ezra*. It is well known that the first *Darius* is commonly firnam'd *Hystaspis*, the second *Nothus*, and the third *Codomannus*. Concerning the last, it is put beyond all Dispute by the Consent of all the Chronologers, that he had not the least Share in this Decree or Edict; but about the two first, the most learned Interpreters are very different in their Opinions. (i) *Josephus* refers this Edict to *Darius Hydaspis*, of whom he relates, that being put in mind by *Zorobabel* of his Promise (before he was King) of rebuilding the City and Temple of *Jerusalem*, and to restore all the Vessels and Utensils carried away by *Nebuchadnezzar* to *Babylon*, he joyfully granted his Request, commanding his Governours to conduct him and his Followers safely to *Jerusalem* to perfect the Structure of the Temple, and ordering those of *Phanicia* and *Syria* to furnish them with Cedars from Mount *Libanon*. But tho' Bishop *Usher* stands up in defence of the Opinion of *Josephus*, yet his Relation renders the whole very dubious: For he describes this Edict as an Effect of the Marriage betwixt *Darius Hydaspis* and *Esther*, which, how much contrary it is to Truth, we have spoke of sufficiently before; not to mention the unpardonable Mistake of *Josephus*, when he makes those who went with *Nehemiah* to *Jerusalem* to amount to many Millions. On the other hand, there are very strong Motives which induce us to believe, that the Edict of the Rebuilding of the Temple

It was Darius Nothus *whose Edict is mentioned* Ez c. 6.

(i) Ant. Lib. 9. cap. 4.

was

was made by *Darius Nothus* in the ſecond year of his Reign. For, Firſt, it muſt be underſtood of the Reign of the ſame *Darius*, when the *Jews* lived in *Cieled Houſes*, and the *Temple* laid waſte, which was the Reaſon they were afflicted with a general Scarcity (*k*). Now, there being but 12 years betwixt the Edict of *Cyrus* and the ſecond year of the Reign of *Darius Hydaſpis*, it ſeems very improbable that in ſo ſhort a time, eſpecially under the Reign of *Cambyſes*, the *Jews* ſhould have built themſelves *Ceiled Houſes*, and have quite laid aſide that Zeal they had ſo lately ſhewn in contributing cheerfully towards the Rebuilding of the *Temple* (*l*). Secondly, it is to be underſtood of the Reign of the ſame *Darius*, under whoſe auſpicious Reign the *Jews*, after they had endured a great deal of Miſery, began to enjoy the Benefit of a more peaceable State, purſuant to the Words of God in (*m*) *Zechariah*: *But now I will not be unto the Reſidue of this People as in the former days, ſaith the Lord of Hoſts: For the Seed ſhall be more proſperous, the Vine ſhall give her Fruit, and the Ground ſhall give her Encreaſe, and the Heavens ſhall give their Dew, and I will cauſe the Remnant of this People to poſſeſs all theſe things; and it ſhall come to paſs, that as ye were a Curſe among the Heathen and Houſe of* Judah *and Houſe of* Iſrael, *ſo will I ſave you, and ye ſhall be a Bleſſing: Fear not; but let your Hands be ſtrong. For thus ſaith the Lord of Hoſts; As I thought to puniſh you when your Fathers provoked me to Wrath, ſaith the Lord of Hoſts, and I repented not: ſo again have I thought in theſe Days to do well unto* Jeruſalem *and to the Houſe of* Judah: *Fear ye not.* But who is ſo little verſed in the Hiſtory of the *Jewiſh* Nation, as to be ignorant of the many and various Calamities the *Jews* groaned under af-

(*k*) Hagg. 1. v. 4. c. 2. v. 16. (*l*) Ezr. 2. v. 68. ſeq. (*m*) C. 8. v. 11. ſeq Hag. 2. v. 9.

ter

ter the Reign of *Darius Hydaſpis*. Thirdly, the above-cited Paſſages are to be underſtood of the ſame *Darius* who lived and reigned many years after the Solution of the *Babylonian* Captivity, it being evident out of (*n*) *Ezra*, that the *Perſian* Nobles had not the leaſt Remembrance of the Edict publiſhed in behalf of the *Jews* by *Cyrus*: For which Reaſon it was that they were obliged to ſearch the Royal Records. But this appears in no wiſe agreeable to the Reign of *Dar. Hydaſpis*, there being but a few years betwixt the beginning of the Reign of *Cyrus*, and that of this *Darius*, who, it is probable, was one of the chief *Perſian* Lords under *Cyrus*. But this being applied to the Reign of *Darius* II. ſirnamed *Nothus*, there remains not the leaſt Difficulty, there being betwixt *Cyrus* and *Darius Nothus* above a hundred years. For the Confirmation of which, I cannot but alledge here the Words of (*o*) *Rupertus*, formerly Profeſſor in the Univerſity of *Altorf*: 'If 'it was *Darius Hydaſpis* that granted Leave to 'the *Jews* to rebuild the Temple; how is it 'poſſible that the Edict of *Cyrus* (concerning the 'Reſtauration of the *Jews*) could be ſo entirely 'forgotten? For *Darius Hydaſpis* was one of 'the principal *Perſian* Lords under *Cyrus*; and 'yet this ſame *Darius* is obliged to have Recourſe 'to the Records. *Nehemiah* was forced to in-'ſpect the Genealogies of thoſe that returned 'with *Zorobabel*, when at the time of *Darius* 'Hydaſpis there were living ſuch among them 'as were able to give an Account of their own 'Deſcent. What can be more abſurd? When 'we therefore read of *Darius*, that he ordered 'the Records to be ſearched; and of *Nehemiah*, 'that he was obliged to inſpect the Genealogies; 'we may rationally conclude with *Scaliger*, that

(*n*) Cap. 5. v. 6. (*o*) Hiſt. Univ p. 158.

'the

'the Edict of *Cyrus* was not a thing of a late 'Date, at that time when *Darius* was petitioned 'about the Rebuilding of the Temple; and 'that conſequently it could not be *Darius Hy-'daſpis* who was coetaneous with *Cyrus*, but '*Darius Nothus*, who granted Liberty to the '*Jews* to rebuild their Temple. Fourthly, The Words in *Haggai* and *Zechariah* are to be underſtood of the ſame *Darius* who was, at leaſt, the third after *Cyrus*; it being evident from the following words of (p) *Ezra*, that *Ahaſuerus* and *Artaxerxes* reigned betwixt *Cyrus* and this *Darius*; and that under both their Reigns the Building of the Temple was obſtructed. Theſe are his Words: *And the People of the Land hired Counſellours againſt the People of* Judah, *to fruſtrate their Purpoſe all the Days of* Cyrus *King of* Perſia, *even unto the Reign of* Darius *King of* Perſia. *And in the Reign of* Ahaſuerus, *in the Beginning of his Reign wrote they unto him an Accuſation againſt the Inhabitants of* Judah *and* Jeruſalem: *And in the Days of* Artaxerxes *writ* Biſhlam, Mithridat, Tabeel, *and the reſt of their Companions, unto* Artaxerxes *King of* Perſia, *and the Writing of the Letter was written in the* Syrian *Tongue, and interpreted in the* Syrian *Tongue.* And in the 17th and following Verſes of the ſame Chapter may be read the Anſwer of *Artaxerxes*, forbidding the Rebuilding of the Temple. But betwixt *Cyrus* and *Darius Hydaſpis* there reigned but one lawful King, which was *Cambyſes*; wherefore the Words of *Ezra*, both in this Paſſage and in the 6th Chapter, v. 1. 15. cannot be underſtood from the Son of *Hydaſpis*: Whereas on the other Hand *Darius Nothus* having reigned betwixt the two *Artaxerxes's*, to wit, *Artaxerxes Longimanus*, and *Artaxerxes Mnemon*, all the Circumſtances of the

(p) Cap. 4. ver. 5, 6, 7.

Holy

Holy Text concur for his Reign. Notwithſtanding the unqueſtionable Perſpicuity of this Argument, *Dionyſius Petavius* has found out another Objection againſt *Scaliger*, which has been embrac'd and promoted by ſome of his Followers. Among the reſt, a certain Modern (*q*) Author has the following Words: 'This *Cambyſes*, this *Smerdes*, the Son of *Cyrus*, either true 'or ſuppoſititious, we believe to have been the 'ſame with *Ahaſuerus* and *Artaxerxes*, mention'd 'in the Scripture; as appears out of the Words 'of (*r*) *Daniel*, where it is ſaid, "That after *Cy*-"*rus*, till the time of *Artaxerxes*, there reigned "three Kings over *Perſia*; which would not be 'agreeable to the Catalogue of the *Perſian* Kings, 'if *Smerdes* were not numbred among them. 'The Objection that there is to the Congruity both 'in the Letters and Syllables betwixt *Artaxerxes* 'and *Cambyſes*, and *Ahaſuerus* and *Smerdes*, is of 'little Moment: For *Cambyſes* and *Smerdes* were 'their Names when they lived yet in a private 'Condition, or were perhaps their Sirnames, 'which afterwards, when they attained the Royal 'Dignity, were changed and tranſmuted into 'thoſe of *Ahaſuerus* and *Artaxerxes*. So accord-'ing to (*s*) *Joſephus*, the Son of *Xerxes* was by 'his Father called *Cyrus*, by the *Greeks Ar*-'*taxerxes*, and in the Scripture *Ahaſuerus*; and if 'we may rely upon the Teſtimony of *Seder O*-'*lam* (*t*) *Rabba*, the *Perſians* called all their Kings 'Artaxerxes. Thus far thoſe who would have *Darius*, mentioned in *Ezra* and by the other Prophets, to have been the Son of *Hyſtaſpes*; which is in no wiſe agreeable to the true Computation of the Hiſtory of theſe Times. And to make *Artaxerxes* the ſame with *Cambyſes*, and

(*q*) Author Perizonii Chronol. (*r*) C. 2. v. 2. (*s*) L. 11. c. 6. Ant. (*t*) C. 30.

Aha-

Ahasuerus the same with *Smerdes*, is an unaccountable Way of arguing. It is undeniable, that among the *Persian* Kings there was a Suppositious or Pseudo-*Smerdes*; but that he should be the same *Ahasuerus* mentioned in Scripture, is not alone very improbable, but absolutely contradictory to Truth, it being manifest out of *Herodote*, that this *Magus* did reign only a few Months; which time he bestowed in settling himself in the Throne which he had usurped, not in oppressing the *Jews*. And what is related of *Ahasuerus* in the Book of *Esther*, has very little or no Relation to the Pseudo-*Smerdes*, this Impostor having never appear'd in publick during his short Reign, which lasted only a few Months, not 7 Years, as it is said of *Ahasuerus* (*u*). It is also very evident from all the Circumstances of the Original Text in *Ezra*, that in those ancient times; (for what hapned since in that kind we will not pretend to dispute at this time) all the *Persian* Kings were called *Artaxerxes's*, or *Artasastas's*, or *Ahasuerus's*. There are likewise some who maintain, that *Ezra* did by *Artaxerxes* and *Ahasuerus* understand one and the same King of *Persia*: but contrary to the Tenure of the Sacred History, which assigns them not only different Names, but also different Actions. For under the Reign of *Ahasuerus* divers Accusations were brought against the *Jews*, but without Success: Whereas in the time of *Artaxerxes* the *Jews* were, pursuant to a Royal Mandat, publickly oppos'd in the building of the Temple by their Enemies. Fifthly, If, according to our Opinion, by this *Darius* is to be understood *Darius Nothus*, and the Beginning of these 70 annual Weeks be fixed in the second year of his Reign, this Interval, as described by the Angel *Gabriel*, will, by a just

(*u*) Esth. 2. v. 16.

Com-

Computation, founded upon undeniable Chronological Characters amount exactly to 490 years, till the time of the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*. Wherefore we conclude with the Words of (x) *Scaliger*: 'It is, ſays he, very apparent, that 'this *Darius*, in the ſecond year of whoſe Reign 'the Rebuilding of the Temple was begun a-'freſh, muſt be *Darius Nothus*, who reigned be-'twixt the two *Artaxerxes's*, *viz. Art. Machrocir.* 'or *Longimanus* and *Artaxerxes Mnemon* or *Me-'mor.* The Predeceſſor of *Artaxerxes Longimanus* 'could be no other Perſon but *Xerxes*, who is 'called *Oxyares* in the Scripture, which was 'his Name before he obtained the Royal 'Dignity.'

The Age of Zorobabel *and* Joſhua *are not contradictory to our Opinion.*

§. 9. Thoſe who differ from us in Opinion concerning this *Darius* mentioned by *Ezra*, make, among others, this Objection, That our Hypotheſis is not agreeable to the Age of *Zorobabel* and *Joſhua*; which Objection being anſwered very ſuccinctly by (y) *Joſ. Scalig.* I think it not beyond our Purpoſe to inſert his Words: 'They 'make, ſays he, this Objection; becauſe from 'the time of the Edict of *Cyrus*, when *Zorobabel* 'and *Joſhua* were ſent to *Jeruſalem*, till the 2d 'year of the Reign of *Darius Nothus*, are leſs or 'more 106 years. And, ſay they, how could they 'be living after 106 years? But, for my part, I 'ſee no great Occaſion why they ſhould ſo much 'wonder at it, there being not wanting Exam-'ples in the Holy Scripture, that ſeveral Perſons, 'but eſpecially *Thoſe whom God had choſen Inſtru-'ments to rule his People and Church, have lived 'above 130 years. And don't we ſee in our Age 'ſome who attain to the Age of 120 years, and are 'in their full Senſes?* But what is moſt remarka-

(x) Lib. 7. p. 591. de Emend. Temp. (y) Lib. 6. p. 603. de Em. Temp.

ble

ble, is, that *Petavius*, who is the main Champion againſt ours and *Scaliger*'s Opinion, and looks upon the Age of *Zorobabel* as a thing very improbable, is very liberal in attributing, at leaſt the ſame Age to *Sanballat*. For (*z*) *Petavius* himſelf makes *Nehemiah*'s Journey into *Palæſtine* coincident with the 4259th year of the *Julian* Period; and it is evident out of (*a*) *Nehemiah*, that the before-mentioned *Sanballat* flouriſhed about the ſame time. Now, according to *Petavius*'s own Hypotheſis, *Alexander* beſieged *Tyrus* in the year of the *Julian* Period 4382; ſo that from the time of *Nehemiah*'s Journey into *Palæſtine* (when *Sanballat* flouriſhed) till the taking of *Tyrus*, after a Siege of 7 Months, are to be accounted 123 years: For the before-named *Sanballat* aſſiſted in the Siege of *Tyrus*, and died not long after in *Alexander*'s Camp in the Siege of *Gaza*, as may be ſeen more at large in (*b*) *Joſephus*. From whence it is evident, that ſuppoſing this *Sanballat* but 27 years old at the time of *Nehemiah*'s Journey into *Palæſtine*, he was 150 years old when he died, and conſequently *Petavius* contradicts his own Opinion. But there is ſomething peculiar in the Age of *Zorobabel* and *Joſhua*, which is ſo far from carrying with it the leaſt Improbability, that long Life was promiſed as a particular Benefit from God, to all ſuch as ſhould return from the *Babylonian* Captivity, according to (*c*) *Zechariah*: 'Thus 'ſaith the *LORD of Hoſts*, There ſhall yet old 'Men and old Women dwell in the Streets of '*Jeruſalem*, and every Man with his Staff in his 'hand for very Age.' Many Examples might be produced of ſuch Perſons as have lived to a great Age, in *Scaliger*'s Behalf: But for Shortneſs

(*z*) Lib. 13. de Doctr. Temp. (*a*) C. 4. (*b*) L. 12. c. 8. Ant. (*c*) C. 8. v. 4.

fake, we are willing to paſs them by in Silence; and refer the Reader to other Hiſtorians.

The Interval of above 100 years is not contradictory to our Opinion.

§. 10. Thoſe who pretend that the Son of *Darius Hydaſpis* is to be underſtood in the above-mentioned Paſſages of *Ezra* and the other Prophets, alledge againſt us, that it is very improbable that the Inhabitants of the Country ſhould have nouriſhed their Hatred againſt the *Jews* for 110 years, this being the Interval from the Edict of *Cyrus* to the 2d year of the Reign of *Darius Nothus*. But I cannot ſee the leaſt Improbability why the Inhabitants of the Country who were profeſs'd Enemies of the *Jews*, and envious of their Proſperity, ſhould not have propagated their Hatred to their Poſterity: Wherefore I cannot but agree once more with (d) *Scaliger*, That ſince *Nehemiah* himſelf confeſſes, that in the 20th year of the Reign of *Artaxerxes* he was for a conſiderable time employed in ſearching into, and finding out the true Genealogies of ſuch of the *Jews* as returned with *Zorobabel*, and that the ſame is confirmed by *Ezra*; who ſays, that *Darius Nothus* ordered the Royal Libraries and Records to be ſearched, to find out the Edict of *Cyrus*. Nothing can be more evident, than that there were a very few living at that time of thoſe who returned with *Zorobabel*, that could give a verbal Account of their Deſcent; and that the Edict of *Cyrus* was of ſo ancient a Date, as to be paſt the Memory of Men.

Whether the Paſſage in Zechariah be contradictory to our Opinion.

§. 11. Thoſe who are not pleaſed with *Scaliger*'s Chronological Computation, alledge among other Matters, againſt him, that the following Paſſage in (e) *Zechariah* contradicts his Hypotheſis concerning *Darius*: 'Then the Angel of the 'LORD anſwered and ſaid, O LORD of Hoſts,

(d) L. 6 p. 594. de Em. Temp. (e) C. 1. v. 12.

'how

'how long wilt thou not have Mercy on *Jeruſa-*
'*lem*, and on the Cities of *Judah*, againſt which
'thou haſt had Indignation theſe threeſcore and
'ten years. From whence they draw the follow-
ing Conſequence, That ſince from the time of
the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, till the ſecond
year of *Darius Nothus*, are elapſed above 70
years, the Reſtauration of the Temple is not to
be referred to that King's Reign. But *Scaliger*
has anſwered them very well, that this Paſſage
of *Zechariah* is as little agreeable to their Opini-
on concerning *Darius Hydaſpis*, ſince theſe 70
years differ as well from the time of *Darius*
Hydaſpis, as of the ſecond year of *Darius No-*
thus. He adds therefore, that thoſe 70 years of
which mention is made by the Angel in *Zecha-*
riah, begin about the 29th or 30th year of the
Reign of *Darius Hydaſpis*, when the *Jews* were
ſorely oppreſſed by their Enemies, and their Con-
dition grew worſe after the Death of the ſaid
Darius, about the beginning of the Reign of
Artaxerxes, as may be ſeen more at large in
(*f*) *Ezra*.

§. 12. And thus having given you an Account of the different Opinions among the Chronologers concerning *Darius*, we will now proceed to the main Point in queſtion, and endeavour to prove by the following Arguments, that the Beginning of this Interval of the 70 Annual Weeks ought to be made coincident with the ſecond year of *Darius Nothus*.

The Beginning of the 70 Weeks is to be fixed in the 2d year of Darius Nothus.

1. *At what time was iſſued the moſt ſolemn and peremptory Mandat of the Reſtauration of the City and the Sanctuary (in reſpect of which ſhe is called the Holy City) which was put in Execution accordingly, from that time ought to*

(*f*) C. 4. v. 5. c. 6.

begin the Computation of the 70 Weeks mention'd in Daniel;

But in the ſecond year of the Reign of Darius Nothus *ſuch a ſolemn and peremptory Mandat was iſſued forth:*

Therefore the 70 Weeks mentioned in Daniel, *&c.*

The Major Propoſition is evident from the Words of the Angel. It was requiſite that that ſame Edict, from the iſſuing forth of which were to begin theſe 70 Weeks, ſhould have ſome peculiar Prerogative above all the others, which was, that, purſuant to this Edict, the *Jews* rebuilt their City and Temple, which they had not been able to effect hitherto, tho' back'd by others. The *Minor* Propoſition is ſufficiently proved out of *Haggai*, *Zachariah* and *Ezra*; from whence it is evident, that the Decree made in the ſecond year of *Darius Nothus*, was the moſt ſolemn Edict in reſpect of God, who cauſed the ſame to be publiſhed by the Prophets *Haggai* and *Zachariah*; in reſpect of the King of *Perſia*, who not only poſitively commanded the Reſtauration of the Temple, but alſo threatned thoſe who ſhould oppoſe the *Jews* in this Undertaking, and likewiſe furniſhed the neceſſary Charges; and laſtly, in reſpect of the happy Succeſs which was owing to the Decree of *Darius*; it being ſaid in (g) *Ezra*, That the Houſe was finiſhed on the third Day of the Month *Adar*, which was the 6th year of the Reign of *Darius*. And this Argument is ſo convincing, that not only the moſt famous modern Chronologers, to wit, *Scaliger*, *Ubbo Emmius*, *Calviſius*, *Mich. Mæſtlinus*, *Franckenbergerus*, and many more, but alſo ſome of the ableſt Divines; and eſpecially *Helvicus*,

(g) Ezr. 6. v. 1. ſequ. (h) C. 6. v. 16.

Beh-

Behmius, and *G. Konig* Professor of Divinity in the University of *Altorf*, with many others, agree in this Point, that the Beginning of these 70 Weeks ought to be fixed at the time of the Edict issued forth in the 2d year of *Darius Nothus*. *LUTHER* himself, tho' he was of Opinion, that this *Darius* was the same, who in prophane History is called *Artaxerxes Longimanus*, which Error might be very pardonable when Chronology was as yet involved in many Difficulties, of which it has been cleared since: Nevertheless he puts it beyond all Doubt, that the Interval of these 70 Weeks ought to begin with the 2d year of the same *Darius*, when this Solemn Edict was published, as may be seen in his Preface to the Prophet *Haggai*:

2. *That year, which, by counting backwards, is coincident with the 490th year from the Destruction of the 2d Temple, is the same year where the Interval of these 70 Weeks ought to begin:*

But the 2d year of the Reign of Darius Nothus *is the 490th year, counting backwards from the Destruction of the 2d Temple:*

Therefore these 70 years, &c.

The *Major* Proposition will be proved more at large hereafter from the Angelical Prediction, and the Term prefixed by the Angel in (*i*) *Daniel*, and from a Parallel Passage in (*k*) *Matthew*. The *Minor* Proposition is easie to be proved; for it has been shewn before in a particular Chapter, and is approved by the joint Consent of *Scaliger*, *Petavius* and many others of the best Chronologers, that the Destruction of the 2d Temple happened in the year of the *Julian* Period 4783. If therefore

(*i*) C. 9. v. 24. 26. (*k*) C. 24. v. 15.

from 4783 be ſubtracted 490 years, there remains 4293, Year of the *Julian* Period, which, that it was coincident with the 2d year of *Darius Nothus* is thus demonſtrable: *Artaxerxes Longimanus* the Predeceſſour of *Darius Nothus* died, according to (*l*) *Ptolemy*, in the 324th year of the *Nabonaſſarean* Epocha; and the 324th year of the *Nabonaſſarean* Epocha is coincident with the 4291ſt year of the *Julian* Period. If therefore the laſt year of the Reign of *Artaxerxes Longimanus* was the 4291ſt year, and alſo the firſt of *Darius Nothus*, it follows, that the 5293d year was the ſecond of the Reign of the ſame *Darius*.

3. *That time from whence, by a juſt Computation are accounted 7 annual Weeks or 49 Years, till the finiſhing of the Streets and Walls of the City (a due Regard being alſo had to the ſubſequent Intervals) ought to be made the Beginning of the 70 Weeks:*

But from the 2d year of the Reign of Darius Nothus *till the finiſhing of the Walls and Streets of the City, are computed 7 annual Weeks or 49 Years, without any Prejudice to the ſubſequent Intervals:*

Therefore theſe 70 Years, &c.

The *Major* Propoſition is evident from the Words of the Angel. The *Minor* concerning the 7 annual Weeks is thus proved out of (*m*) *Nehemiah*. '*Nehemiah* after the finiſhing of the Walls, re-'turned in the 32d year of the Reign of *Artax-'erxes*. (And that this was under *Artax. Memor*, we ſhall have Occaſion to prove hereafter.) *Darius Nothus* reigned in all 19 years; ſo that from the 2d year of his Reign, till the 32d of his

(*l*) Can. Chron. (*m*) C. 13. v. 6.

Suc-

Succeſſour are to be computed 49 years, which exactly amounts to the Number mentioned by the Angel. Of the other particular Intervals we ſhall ſay more hereafter.

4. *According to which Opinion the Angelical Weeks (due Regard being had to other Circumſtances) begin and end with the* Sabbatick *and* Jubilean Cycles; *that Opinion carries along with it more Probability than the others:*

But our Opinion has this Prerogative, as is mentioned in the Beginning of this Chapter:

Therefore our Opinion, &c.

The *Major* Propoſition we prove from thence, that it appears very probable, that when the Angel made mention of the Annual Week, he made Reflection upon the *Sabbatick* and *Jubilean Cycles*, theſe being in the Holy Scripture likewiſe called Weeks, as has been ſhewn before. The *Minor* is proved by the Calculation inſerted in the 172d and following Pages of this Epitome.

§. 13. As we have given you our Opinion concerning the Beginning of this Interval of the 70 Weeks; ſo we will likewiſe take a View of what has been maintained by others, eſpecially concerning *Artaxerxes*, or *Artaſaſta*, in the 7th year of whoſe Reign (*n*) *Ezra* went into *Paleſtine*, as did (*o*) *Nehemiah* in the 20th year of his Reign. Thoſe who differ from us in Opinion about the Beginning of the 70 Weeks, do alſo diſagree with us concerning this *Artaxerxes*: For thoſe who would fix the Beginning of this Interval of 70 Weeks to the time of theſe Edicts mentioned by *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*, under-

Who was Artaxerxes mentioned by Ezra and Nehemiah.

(*n*) C. 7. v. 6. (*o*) C. 2. v. 1.

ſtand by this *Artaxerxes* the ſame who is ſirnamed *Longimanus*; of which Opinion are *Africanus*, *Joh. Funccius*, *Henr. Buntingus*, *Tho. Lydiott*, *Temporarius*, *Dion. Petav.* *Will. Lange*, *Rob. Baily*, and others. On the other hand *Scaliger* and his Followers underſtand by this *Artaſaſta*, *Artaxerxes* II, the Succeſſour of *Darius Nothus*, the ſame *Artaxerxes* who is ſirnamed *Memor*; which Opinion we will endeavour to maintain by the following Arguments:

1. *By* Artaſaſta *or* Artaxerxes, *mentioned by* Ezra, *is to be underſtood the ſame King of* Perſia, *who reigned, not only after* Cyrus, Ahaſuerus, *and* Darius *(mentioned by* Ezra,) *but alſo after another King of* Perſia *of the ſame Name:*

But Artaxerxes Memor, *and not* Artaxerxes Longimanus, *is the ſame King, who reigned, not only after* Cyrus, Ahaſuerus *and* Darius, *but alſo after another King of* Perſia *of the ſame Name:*

Therefore Artaxerxes, *&c.*

The *Major* Propoſition is evident from the Words of *Ezra* in the 4th Chapter, where he gives an Account of the Troubles befaln the *Jews*, under the Reigns of *Cyrus*, *Ahaſuerus* and *Artaxerxes*; and again in the 7th Chapter, where he mentions another *Artaſaſta* or *Artaxerxes*, in the 6th year of whoſe Reign *Ezra* did go into *Palæſtine*: See what has been ſaid before upon thoſe Paſſages of *Ezra*. The *Minor* Propoſition we prove out of the Catalogue of the *Perſian* Kings and their Succeſſion.

2. *The ſame* Artaſaſta *or* Artaxerxes, *of whom it is ſaid, that he obſtructed the Rebuilding of the Temple, and by his Edicts ſhewed himſelf an Enemy to the* Jewiſh *Nation, cannot rationally be ſuppoſed to be the ſame whom*

Ezra

Ezra *and* Nehemiah *praiſes for his Affection and Benefits beſtowed upon the* Jews:

But Artaſaſta *or* Artaxerxes, *who in prophane Hiſtory is ſirnamed* Longimanus, *is the ſame, of whom it is ſaid, that he obſtructed the Rebuilding of the Temple, and by his Edicts ſhewed himſelf an Enemy to the* Jews:

Therefore Artaxerxes Longimanus, *&c.*

The *Major* Propoſition proves it ſelf: The *Minor* is evident from the Words of *Ezra*, cited before out of his 4th Chapter.

3. *The ſame* Artaſaſta *or* Artaxerxes, *from whoſe Reign till the time of* Alexander the Great *there is a larger Interval of Years than is ſuitable to the Age of Men, and particularly to that of* Sanballat *and* Nehemiah *(according to the Judgment of thoſe of a contrary Opinion) is not to be ſuppoſed to be the ſame mentioned by* Ezra *and* Nehemiah:

But from the Reign of Artaxerxes, *ſirnamed* Longimanus, *till the time of* Alexander the Great, *there is a larger Interval of Years than is ſuitable to the Age of Men, but eſpecially to that of* Sanballat *and* Nehemiah *(even according to the Judgment of thoſe of a contrary Opinion:*

Therefore Artaxerxes Longimanus, *&c.*

The *Major* Propoſition is 1ſt evident from thence, that *Sanballat* did flouriſh in the time of *Nehemiah (p)*, about the year of the Reign of *Artaxerxes* XXVI. and likewiſe ſerved under *Alexander the Great*. 2dly, That *Nehemiah* was alſo living ſtill about the time of *Alexander the Great*, is manifeſt from thence, that he makes

(p) Neh. 4. Joſ. Lib. 12. c. 8. Ant.

men-

mention in his 12th Chapter in the 11th Verſe, of *Jaddua*, whoſe meeting with *Alexander the Great* is famous among the *Jews*. *Corn. à Lapide* and his Adherents have found out this Exception, That this part of the Book of *Nehemiah* was not writ till after his Death; and that *Nehemiah* might have ſeen *Jaddua*, not when he was High Prieſt, but when as yet in his tender Years. But the firſt Objection has not ſo much as the leaſt Probability in it, the whole Content of the Words of *Nehemiah* ſufficiently evincing, that both the preceding and following Words of the Relation concerning *Jaddua* could be writ by no body but *Nehemiah* himſelf: And which way can it rationally be ſuppoſed that *Nehemiah* did not know *Jaddua*, when it is expreſly ſaid, that he removed *Manaſſeh* the Brother of *Jaddua* from his Perſon; becauſe he was Son-in-Law to *Sanballat*. See *Nehemiah* Chapt. 13. v. 28. and *Joſephus*, *Lib.* 13. But, to take away all further Scruple, it is ſaid, Theſe were the chief Men in the time of *Nehemiah*: And what is more abſurd and ridiculous than to ſuppoſe that Children were inſerted in the Catalogue of the Principal Men. The *Minor* Propoſition is proved by the Interval of Time betwixt *Artaxerxes Longimanus* and *Alexander the Great*: For ſuppoſing *Sanballat* to have been 30 years of Age in the 20th year of the Reign of *Artaxerxes Longimanus*, by adding the ſeveral Years of the Reigns of the *Perſian* Kings to it according to the Catalogue of theſe Kings, we may, without much Difficulty, inveſtigate the Age of both theſe Perſons.

In the 20th year of the Reign of *Artaxerxes Longimanus*, *Nehemiah* and *Sanballat* are ſuppoſed to be 30 years of Age.

Add

Add to these the remaining Part of *Artaxerxes Longimanus* his

Reign,	*Years.*
	21
The Reign of Darius Nothus,	19
Of Artaxerxes Memor,	46
Of Ochus,	21
Of Arostus,	2
Of Darius Codomannus,	4
Thus *Nehemiah* and *Sanballat* at the time of *Alexander the Great* were	143 *Years of Age.*

4. *The same* Artaxerxes *is understood by* Ezra *and* Nehemiah, *from the 20th year of whose Reign, to count backwards to* Cyrus, *are elapsed so many years as are sufficient to obliterate the Genealogies of those that returned out of the* Babylonian *Captivity:*
But this may fitly be applied to Artaxerxes Memor:
Therefore, &c.

The *Major* Proposition is proved out of the 7th Chapter of *Nehemiah*. The *Minor* derives its Certainty from the before-mentioned Catalogue. Neither have our Adversaries any thing else to object against this Argument, but the Longævity of *Nehemiah* and *Sanballat*, which has been sufficiently answered before.

§. 14. *Joh. Funccius, Henr. Buntingus, Lansbergius*, and many of their Followers are of Opinion that the beginning of these 70 Weeks ought to be fixed to the time of the Edict of the 7th year of *Artaxerxes*, mentioned in *Ezra*. *Funccius* appoints its Beginning exactly on the 12th day of *March*, when *Ezra* and the *Jews* began their Jour-

Whether this Computation of Daniel ought to begin with the time of the Edict of the 7th year of Artaxerxes, *mentioned in* Ezr. 7. v. 6.

Journey from the River *Ahava* towards *Jeruſalem*; but their Hypotheſis is founded upon a wrong *Baſis*, by confounding *Artax. Longimanus* with *Artax. Memor.* Beſides that, in the 7th year of this *Artaxerxes* mentioned in *Ezra* (underſtand which of the two you will) no particular Command or Edict was iſſu'd for rebuilding the Temple and Holy City, but only for the Return of the Remainders of the *Jews* to *Jeruſalem* under the Direction of *Ezra*. And ſince, according to their own Hypotheſis, the Structure of the Temple was compleated before, to wit, in the 6th year of the Reign of *Darius Hyſtaſpis*, it is evident that this Edict cannot have any Relation to that mentioned by the (r) Angel. *Lanſbergius*, to avoid this Contradiction, has invented this Expedient, That the two ſeveral Mandates or Edicts iſſued by *Artaxerxes*, one in the 7th year of his Reign concerning the *RESTAURATION* of the *Jews* (under the Direction of *Ezra*) the other in the 20th year of his Reign, concerning the Rebuilding of *JERUSALEM*, (under the Direction of *Nehemiah*) ought to be joined together; and what is wanting in one to accommodate the whole to the Words of the Angel, muſt be ſupplied out of the other. But how can it be conceived, that a certain Number of Years can be determined and fixed to the End of a certain Term beginning from ſuch different times, as is the 7th and 20th years of *Artaxerxes*? This Arithmetical Nicety of *Lanſbergius*, I confeſs, is paſt my Apprehenſion, nothing being more certain, than that thoſe who attribute a double Beginning to theſe 70 Weeks, muſt at the ſame time acknowledge a double Period or End, which is contradictory to the Words of the Angel, who mentions

(r) Daniel 9. ver. 25.

only

only μοναδικῶς an *Edict* or *Mandate*, not παλιθυντικῶς, *Edicts*.

§. 15. *Africanus* and *Theodoretus*, and among our Modern Authors, *Tho. Lydiott*, *Joh. Temporarius*. *Corn. à Lapide*, *Joh. Voſſius*, and others, who interpret the Words in *Ezra* and *Nehemiah* of *Artaſaſta* or *Artax. Longimanus*, begin this Epocha of the 70 Weeks with the 20th year of this Reign, when *Nehemiah* went up to *Jeruſalem* to rebuild the Walls and Gates of the City. But above all the reſt, (*ſ*) *Dionyſ. Petav.* patronizes this Opinion, which however he explains in a peculiar manner: *We do* (ſays he) *agree for the moſt part with thoſe who begin theſe* 70 *Weeks with the* 20*th Year of the Reign of* Artaxerxes Longimanus: *But we differ from them in the Computation of theſe* 20 *Years, which we begin, not from the time of the Death of* Xerxes, *but from the time he was made his Conſort in the Empire. So that the Beginning of the Reign of* Artaxerxes *admits of a two-fold Explication; one to be fixed in the* 12*th year of the Reign of* Xerxes, *in the Year of the* Julian *Period* 4240; *the other immediately after his Death, in the Year of the* Julian *Period* 4249; Artaxerxes *having reigned as a Conſort with his Father near* 10 *years, or at leaſt enjoyed the Title of a King.* And ſoon after, *The* 20*th Year of the Reign of* Artaxerxes (*to reckon from its firſt Beginning*) *is coincident with the* 4259*th Year of the* Julian *Period, with the* 2*d Year of the* 81*ſt Olympiad, with the Year of the World* 3529. *If the Epocha of the* 70 *Weeks or of* 490 *Years be begun from this* 20*th Year of his Reign, its Period is coincident with the Year of the* Julian *Period* 4748, *with that of the World* 4018, *which is coincident with the* 4*th Year after the Paſſion of Chriſt: So that in*

Whether the Beginning of this Computation is to be fixt to the time of the 20*th Year of* Artaxerxes.

(*ſ*) L. 12. c. 32. de Doct. Temp.

the

the third Year of the 30th Week the MESSIAH *was cut off. For the Prophecy of this Interval of 70 Weeks ought not to be interpreted thus; as if the Myſtery foretold by it was not to be accompliſhed till the total Expiration of theſe Weeks: But it is ſufficient that its Accompliſhment is to be looked for in the laſt Week of this Interval, though not brought quite to its final Period.* Thus far *Petavius*. Againſt this Hypotheſis built upon the erroneous Suppoſition, that *Artaſaſta* mentioned in *Ezra* and *Nehemiah* is the ſame with *Artax. Longimanus*, the Arguments alledged in the preceding Paragraph may take place for the moſt part: Beſides which, we will inſert the following Objections in Contradiction of this erroneous Opinion. Firſt, The Edict of *Artaxerxes* (whether *Longimanus* or *Memor*) had only a Relation to the repairing the Walls and Ditches of the City that was rebuilt before: But the Angel mentions expreſly the Words of *Rebuilding of* Jeruſalem; And it appears very improbable to me, that the Holy Scripture ſhould have paſs'd by the Epocha of Rebuilding the City, and in lieu of it ſubſtituted, that from the Rebuilding of the Walls. Secondly, It was foretold by the Angel, that the Streets and Walls of the City were to be accompliſhed in the ſpace of 7 annual Weeks: But if the Epocha of 70 Weeks is to be begun from the 20th Year of the Reign of *Artaxerxes*, how are theſe 49 Years to be computed, (*u*) *Nehemiah* being (according to his own Teſtimony) returned from *Jeruſalem* in the 32d Year of *Artaxerxes*. Thirdly, if theſe 70 Weeks muſt begin in the 20th Year of *Artaxerxes Longimanus*, their Period muſt be coincident with the Year 4760 of the *Julian* Period, in which Year hapned neither the Paſſion of

(*u*) Cap. 13. ver. 6.

Chriſt,

Christ, or the Destruction of *Jerusalem*. For *Art. Longimanus* began his Reign, according to *Ptolemy* and the other ancient Chronologers, in the Year of the *Nabonassarean* Epocha 284: So that the 20th Year of his Reign was coincident with the 304th *Nabonassarean* Year, or the 4270th Year of the *Julian* Period; unto which, if 490 Years be added, it produces 4760 of the *Julian* Period. But it is sufficiently demonstrated in another Place, that Christ suffered Death in the Year of the *Julian* Period 4746; and that the last Destruction of *Jerusalem* hapned in the 70th Year of Christ, or in the 4783 Year of the *Julian* Period. From whence it is evident that this Computation from the 20th Year of the Reign or *Art. Longimanus*; which has, as I suppose, also induced (x) *Petavius* to confess concerning this fabulous Invention, That this Opinion was not in the least mentioned in any of the Ancient Historians. And, supposing that *Xerxes* in the 12th Year of his Reign, when he was preparing for his Grand Expedition against *Greece*, did (according to the Custom of the ancient *Persian* Monarchs) nominate *Artaxerxes* his Successour, no Inference can be made from thence, that the same *Artaxerxes* did 7 years after, being the 18th Year of the Reign of *Xerxes*, exercise an absolute Royal Authority, when *Xerxes* was at home in Person: Neither can it be alledged that *Artaxerxes* when he granted his Patent to *Ezra*, could act otherwise than a Sovereign, and only as a Titular King, the said Objection being contradictory to the Words of the said Royal *Diploma*, recited in (y) *Ezra*, *Artaxerxes King of Kings* unto *Ezra*, &c. *I make a Decree, that all they of the People of* Israel, *and of his Priests and* Levites, *in my Realm, which are minded of*

(x) Lib. 10. c. 27. de Doct. Temp. (y) C. 7. v. 11, 12. seq.

their

their free Will to go up to Jeruſalem, *go with thee. Foraſmuch as thou art ſent of the* KING *and of his ſeven Counſellours to enquire concerning* Judah *and* Jeruſalem, *according to the Law of thy God which is in thine hand: and to carry the Silver and Gold which the* KING *and his Counſellours have freely offer'd*, &c. And ſoon after (z), *And I, even I,* Artaxerxes *the* King, *do make a Decree to all the Treaſurers which are beyond the River; that whatſoever* Ezra *ſhall require of you; it be done ſpeedily, unto an hundred Talents of Silver*, &c. From whence it appears, that in the 7th year of *Artaxerxes* mentioned in the Scripture there reigned no other Monarch in *Perſia*, which induces me to argue thus:

If Xerxes *had had an Intention to make his Son* Artaxerxes *his Conſort in the Empire, he would have done it at that Juncture of time when he was undertaking his Expedition againſt* Greece:
But this was not done at that time:
Therefore Artaxerxes, &c.

The *Major* Propoſition proves it ſelf, that Juncture of time when the King with the Chief Men of the Empire were to go upon an Expedition remote from the Empire, being the fitteſt of all to nominate a Succeſſour. The *Minor* is granted by *Petavius* himſelf, when he makes the firſt year of *Artaxerxes* coincident with the 12th Year of the Reign of *Xerxes*. I argue further:

If it be true, that after the Death of Xerxes *there was a Conteſt about the Succeſſion in the Empire, betwixt* Darius *the eldeſt Son of*

(z) Ezra 7. ver. 12.

Xerxes,

Xerxes *and* Artaxerxes, *his younger Son, who by the Assistance of* Artapanus, *obtained the Imperial Crown; it follows, that the said* Artaxerxes *was not constituted King a good many years before his Father's Death; or that he quietly exercised the Royal Sovereign Prerogatives:*

But, according to the Testimony of Diodorus Siculus, Ctesias, *and other Historians, the first is true:*

Therefore also, &c.

The Opinion of *Is. Vos.* has so little Resemblance to Truth, that I cannot but stand amazed how a Man of Sense, and who, besides this, pretends to a considerable share of Learning, could fall into so many Errors at a time, which scarce deserve an Answer.

§. 16. Those who anticipate the time of this Epocha, would have this Interval of the 70 Weeks finish at the time of the last Destruction of *Jerusalem*; for which they alledge the Words of the (*a*) Angel. *And after threescore and two Weeks shall the* Messiah *be cut off.* So that, according to their Opinion, these threescore and two Weeks are to be added to the seven Weeks mentioned before by the Angel; which together make up 59 Weeks till the final Period of this Epocha. But, as we shall have Occasion to say something more about the Division of this Epocha in 7 and 62, so we grant, without the least Contradiction, that the Birth and Passion of the *Messiah* hapned in this Interval of the 70 Weeks; but cannot see, that the least Consequence can be drawn from the Words of the Angel, to make the final Period of this Epocha coincident with the time of the Passion of Christ. For the very

The End of the 70 Weeks is to be fixt at the time of the Destruction of the City.

(*a*) Daniel 9. ver. 26.

INSCRIPTION of this Interval expreſſes clearly the Meaning of the (*b*) Angel, which is, THE REBUILDING AND DESTRUCTION OF THE HOLY CITY: *Seventy Weeks are determined upon thy People and upon thy Holy City*: And it would be very hard to ſuppoſe that the Angel ſhould recede in his ſubſequent Narration, from what he had intimated before in his Introduction. Certainly the Relation of an Hiſtorian would be look'd upon as very incompleat, who having promiſed in his Preface to give an Account of Matters till the laſt Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, ſhould break off the Thread of his Hiſtory 40 years before the ſaid Deſtruction hapned. Beſides, if we look upon the 26th and 27th Verſes of the 9th Chapter of *Daniel*, it will be obvious, that the End of theſe 70 Weeks is deſcribed in ſuch a Manner as has a moſt particular Relation to the Deſtruction of the City by the *Romans*, the Forerunner of which was the *Abomination of Deſolation*, cited by (*c*) Chriſt out of *Daniel*; and who could be a more excellent Interpreter of the Angelical Prediction than Chriſt himſelf.

Concerning the Diviſion of the 70 Weeks into 7 and 62.

§. 17. Having ſaid enough concerning our Hypotheſis of the Beginning and End of this Interval, we muſt add ſomething alſo concerning the Diviſion of it. Theſe are the Words of (*d*) *Scaliger*: *In this Diviſion ſome look for a Myſtery, others divide them into ſeveral Intervals, ſo as to begin the firſt Interval of 7 Weeks with the time of the firſt Edict of* Darius; *the ſecond from thence of 62 Weeks; unto which they add one at laſt. I am againſt both: For I ſee no more Myſtery in the Diviſion of this Interval of 70 Weeks, than in the Diviſion of the* Shekel *in* Ezekiel, *&c.* Which Opinion is likewiſe embraced by (*e*) *Calixtus*. Tho'

(*b*) Dan 9 v. 24. (*c*) Mat. 25 v. 15. Mark. 13. v. 14. (*d*) L. 6. de emend. Temp. (*e*) Orat. de 70 Hebd.

we

we have for the moſt part agreed with *Scaliger* as to the Beginning and End of this Epocha, yet we cannot but blame his Preſumption, in making ſo little Account of the Diviſion of this Interval made by the Angel himſelf; and I am perſwaded that there are few who will imagine that this exact Diviſion of the 70 Weeks in ſo ſolemn a Prophecy as this, could be accidental and of no Moment. See (*f*) *Glaſ. Philol. Sacr.* And concerning the Paſſage in *Ezekiel*, with an Anſwer to the Argument of *Scaliger*, conſult (*g*) *Francius in Schol. Sacrif.*

Whether the 70 and 62 Weeks have a different Beginning.

§. 18. *Scaliger*, as he makes the Beginning of the 70 Weeks coincident with the 2d Year of *Darius Nothus*, and its End with the laſt Deſtruction of the City of *Jeruſalem*: So he finiſhes the 62 Weeks with the Paſſion of Chriſt, and fixes their Beginning in the 5th Year of *Artax. Memor*, with whom agree in this Opinion, *Tremellius*, *Junius*, and ſeveral other Modern Authors; as there are not wanting on the other hand ſome who alledge, that if the 70 and 62 Weeks had a different Beginning, the Word *Commandment* or *Edict*, mentioned by the Angel, ſhould have been expreſs'd in the plural Number. Thoſe who cannot agree with the Opinion of *Scaliger*, I would adviſe to fix the Beginning of theſe 62 Weeks in the 2d Year of *Darius Nothus*, and to include in that Interval the 7 Weeks allotted for the Rebuilding of the Streets and Walls of the City: But leſt we ſhould exceed the Bounds of an Epitome, we will conclude this Chapter, leaving the Determination of the Matter to every one's own Judgment.

(*f*) Lib. 3. can. 52. (*g*) Diſp. 10. Theſ. 16.

CHAP. XXX.

Of the Epocha of the Græcian *Empire in* Asia, *and the Beginning of the Epocha after the last Battle fought betwixt* Alexander the Great *and* Darius Codomannus, *and of the Period of* Calippus.

1. *The Origin of the* Græcian *Empire in* Asia, *must be traced to that time when* Alexander the Great *was declared* Imperator *over all* Greece, *who succeeded his Father in the Kingdom in the same Year that* Eveneto *was* Archon *at* Athens, *and* L. Furius *and* C. Menius *were Consuls at* Rome.
2. Darius Codomannus *began his Reign over* Persia *much about the same time that* Alexander *succeeded his Father* Philip *in the Kingdom of* Macedonia.
3. *Just before the* Græcian *Expedition against* Asia *the* Thebans *were vanquished, at which time* Alexander, *pursuant to the Resolution taken in the Council, did totally destroy the City of* Thebes, *and thereby put all the other* Græcian *Commonwealths that were much inclined to revolt, under a great Consternation.*
4. *In the same Year that* Cteſicles *was* Archon *at* Athens, *and* Caius Sulpicius *and* Lucius Papyrius Roman *Conſuls*, Alexander *marched at the Head of his Army to the* Helleſpont; *from whence having transported his Forces out of* Europe *into* Asia, *he fought the Battle of* Granicum.

5.

5. *In the ſecond Year of the* Aſiatick *War, when the Battle near* Iſſus *was fought,* Nicocratus *was* Archon *at* Athens, *and* Cæſus Duilius *and* L. Papyrius *Conſuls of* Rome.

6. *In the third Year of this* Aſiatick *War of the* Greeks, Nicocratus *was* Archon *among the* Athenians, *and* M. Attilius *and* M. Valeſius *Conſuls of* Rome.

7. *In the ſame third Year, and in the ſecond before the Battle of* Gaugamela, *was the* 114*th Olympiad celebrated, where* Grylus *of* Chalcedon *carried the Day; and in the ſame Year* Tyrus *was likewiſe taken by* Alexander.

8. *In the* 4*th Year of this* Aſiatick *War, when* Darius *was vanquiſhed at* Gaugamela, Ariſtophanes *was* Archon *of* Athens, *and* Sp. Poſthumius *and* T. Veturius Roman *Conſuls.*

9. *In the ſame Year that the Battle of* Gaugamela *was fought,* Alexander, *after his Return from the Temple of* Jupiter Hammonius, *founded the City of* Alexandria. *For theſe Characters we are obliged to* (*a*) Diodorus Siculus, *which are for the moſt part approved by other Hiſtorians.*

10. Alexander, *after the Victory obtained over* Darius *near* Gaugamela, *made himſelf Maſter of* Aſia *in the* 5*th Year of his Reign, according to* (*b*) Juſtin.

11. *The ſame Year was the* 5*th Year of* Darius, *at its Beginning* Ptolemy *allowing but four years for the Reign of* Darius.

12. *Eleven Days before this laſt Battle fought betwixt* Darius *and* Alexander, *there happened a very remarkable Eclipſe of the Moon, according to* (*c*) Plutarch.

13. *The ſame Eclipſe has been obſerved, according to* Plutarch, *in the Month of* Boëdromion, *to-*

(*a*) Lib. 17. (*b*) Lib. 11. Cap. 14. (*c*) Vit. Alexand.

wards the latter End of the Summer, or the Autumnal Æquinox; at which time the Greeks *used to celebrate the* Eleusinia, *dedicated to* Ceres, *of which (d)* L. An. Seneca *has the following Words:*

Quanâ cum longæ redit hora noctis,
Crescere & somnos cupiens quietos
Libra Phœbeos tenet æqua currus:
Turba secretam Cererem frequentat,
Et citi tectis properant relictis,
Attici noctem celebrare mystæ:
Tanta per campos agitur silentes
Turba, &c.

This Eclipse hapned in the year of the Julian *Period* 4383, *on the* 20*th day of* September, *a little before Midnight, the whole Obscuration being of* 14 *Inches; Of which Eclipse (e)* Pliny *likewise makes mention.*

14. *The next following Summer after the Victory obtained by* Alexander *near* Gaugamela, Calippus Cyzicenus *began a new Period of* 76 *years, as is evident from the four Observations of* Timocharis *upon the years* 36, 37, 47, *and* 48, *mentioned by (f)* Ptolemy,

15. *In the same year that* Calippus *began this New Period,* Darius, *whilst he was gathering Recruits in* Bactria, *and the circumjacent Provinces, was made Prisoner by* Bessus *his own Lieutenant over the Province of* Bactria; *who having fettered him with Golden Fetters, at last murthered him, when* Aristophanes *was* Archon *at* Athens, *and* Cn. Domitius *and* Au. Cornelius Roman *Consuls. In this all the Ancient Historians do agree, but especially (g)* Diodor. Sicul.

(d) In Herc. Fur. (e) L. 2. c. 70. (f) L. 7. c. 3. (g) Loc. Cit.

From

From these Characters we conclude that the Battle of Gaugamela *was fought in the year of the* Julian *Period* 4383, *Cycl.* ☉. 15. ☽. 13. *on the first day of* October; *and that the Period of* Calippus *began with the Summer of the* 4384*th year of the* Julian *Period, Cycl.* ☉. 16. ☽. 14. *and that* Dar. Codoman. *the last Monarch of* Persia *was slain in the same year.*

If therefore from any certain year of the Julian *Period be subtracted* 4382 *years and* 9 *months, the Residue shews the year since the beginning of the* Græcian *Empire in* Asia, *or since the Battle fought near* Gaugamela: *And if* 4383 *years and six Months be subtracted in the same manner, the Residue is equivalent to the year since the Beginning of the Period of* Calippus, *or the Death of* Dar. Codomannus. *But if to these years of these Epocha's be added the before mentioned Number of years, the several Products will be correspondent to the several years of the* Julian *Period.*

To find out the year since the Beginning of these Epocha.

§. 1. (*b*) PEtrus *Bizarrus* has made a very large Collection of the Motives which induced *Alexander the Great* to engage in a War against *Darius Codomannus*. The Remembrance of the past Injuries and Troubles the *Greeks* had received from the Hands of *Darius Hydaspis* and *Xerxes*; the private Quarrels with the Family of *Alexander*, who had not only been contumeliously treated by the Ambassadours of *Darius*, and in his Letters, in which he called himself the *King of Kings*, and *Alexander* his Servant, but also his Father's Death, upon whose Head *Darius* had set a vast Sum of Money, and had done the like to *Alexander* himself. But the chief Motive was his immensurable Ambition to build his future

The Occasion of the Asiatic War, and of the ensuing Revolution.

(*b*) L. 2. Hist. Sacr. Pers.

Greatneſs upon the Ruin of the profeſſed Enemies of his Country, as may be conjectured from that Epiſtle writ by *Alexander* in Anſwer to the Letter of *Darius* mentioned by (*i*) *Diodorus Siculus*.

In what place this Battel was fought.

§. 2. The Battle which decided the Fate of the *Aſiatick* Empire betwixt the *Perſians* and *Greeks*; and from whence begins this Epocha, is commonly called the Battle of *Arbela*, whilſt others are of opinion that it was fought near *Gaugamela*. It ſeems to be very ſtrange how the Hiſtorians could confound theſe two Places which lie at about 600 *Stadia* from one another; Of which I can give no better Account than to alledge the Words of (*k*) *Strabo*: *Arbela*, ſays he, *is under the Juriſdiction of* Babylon, *and ſituated not far from it. On the other ſide of the River* Lycus, *in the Plains of* Aturia *is the City of* Ninus. *In the Province of* Aturia *is likewiſe the Village of* Gaugamela, *famous for the great Victory obtained by* Alexander the Great *againſt* Darius, *&c. But the* Macedonians *ſeeing* Gaugamela *to be but a poor Village, and* Arbela *a conſiderable Place, built (as it is reported) by* Arbelus *the Son of* Athmoneus, *they diſperſed it abroad, that they had fought and obtained this ſignal Victory near* Arbela, *which has miſguided ſeveral Hiſtorians into this Error.* Of which conſult the Notes of *Freinſhemius* upon *Curtius*.

Whether Plutarch committed an Error in his Character of the Lunar Eclipſe.

§. 3. (*l*) *Joſeph Scaliger* is of Opinion, that *Plutarch* committed an Error in the Character of this Lunar Eclipſe mentioned before. But the Matter duly weighed, this Objection is made without ſufficient Reaſon, againſt an Hiſtorian of ſo extraordinary a Reputation. For he does not mention expreſly any certain Day of the Month *Boëdromion*, but only the Feaſt of *Eleuſinia*, which

(*i*) L. 17. (*k*) Lib. 16. Georg. p. 507. ad Cauſ. (*l*) L. 5. de Emend. Temp.

was celebrated by the *Greeks* for ſeveral Days together. Beſides that, the Conſtitution of the *Attick* Year as propoſed by *Scaliger*, and according to which he has corrected *Plutarch*, is not ſufficiently eſtabliſhed and approved among us, which is, queſtionleſs, the Reaſon that *Calviſius*, who otherwiſe never fails to follow cloſely the Footſteps of *Scaliger*, has not made the leaſt Animadverſions upon this Paſſage of *Ptolemy*; for which Reaſon it is alſo our Opinion that this Character of ſo ancient an Author ought not to be rejected.

CHAP. XXXI.

Of the time of the Death of Alexander the Great, *and the Epocha of the Years of* Philip.

1. Alexander the Great *lived* 32 *Years and* 8 *Months, which are to be computed from the firſt Year of the* 106*th Olympiad, when* Philip *the Father of* Alexander *received the Congratulations about the Victory obtained by* Sarmenio *over the* Illyrians, *according to* (*a*) Arrian *and* (*b*) Plutarch.
2. Alexander *reigned* 12 *Years and* 7 *or* 8 *Months, according to* Eratoſthenes *in* Clement *of* Alexandrina, (*c*) Diodorus Siculus, Arrian, Euſebius, Sulpitius Severus, *and* 1 Maccab. c. 1. v. 8.
3. *After* 7 *years were compleated ſince the Victory of* Alexander *over* Darius, Alexander *died near* Babylon. (*d*) Sulp. Severus.

(*a*) L. 7. (*b*) Vit. Alex. (*c*) L. 17. (*d*) L. 2.

4.

4. Ageſias *was* Archon *at* Athens *in the ſame year that* Alexander *died.* *See* Diodor. Sicul. Arrian.

5. *In the ſame year were Conſuls of* Rome C. Poetelius *and* L. Papyrius. *See* Diodorus Siculus.

6. *In the ſame year was the* 114*th Olympiad celebrated, where* Micinas *of* Rhodes *carried the Day.* (*e*) Joſephus, Diodor. Sic. (*f*) Arrian. (*g*) Euſebius.

7. Alexander *died* 236 *years after* Cyrus, *who began to reign over* Perſia *at the Beginning of the* 55*th Olympiad.* Euſeb. L. cit.

8. *From the Beginning of the* Nabonaſſarean *Epocha till the Death of* Alexander *are computed* 424 *years according to* (*h*) Ptolemy.

9. *The year of the Chriſtian* Æra 238, *was the* 562*d after the Death of* Alexander, *according to* (*i*) Cenſorinus.

10. 1214 *years after the Death of* Alexander *there was a Solar Eclipſe obſerved at* Aracta; *both the great Luminaries being in the Sign of the Lion; and that the ſame Eclipſe happned in the year of Chriſt* 891, *on the* 8*th day of* Auguſt *about Noon, is manifeſt from the Ecliptical Calculations.* Albategn.

11. *The Death of* Alexander *is thus related by* (*k*) Plutarch: On the 18th day of the Month *Dæſius*, being ſeized with a Fever, he remain'd all that Night in the Bath. The next day after Bathing he hept his Bed-Chamber, where he played at Tables with *Medius*. Having bathed again at Night, and aſſiſted at the Sacrifice, he eat with much Eagerneſs. The ſame Night his Fever return'd again. The 20th day of the Month, after having ba-

---

(*e*) L. 1. contr. Appion. (*f*) L. 7. (*g*) L. 8. demonſtr. Evang. (*h*) L. 3. (*i*) de D. N. c. 21. (*k*) Vit. Alex.

thed

thed again, he aſſiſted at the Solemn Sacrifice; and being laid down in the Bath, he paſs'd his time with a certain Commander of a Ship, who gave him a Relation of his Voyage, and of what he had obſerved otherwiſe moſt remarkable in the Ocean. The 21ſt being paſs'd in the ſame manner, his Fever encreaſed towards Night: And the next day the Fever growing more violent, he was carried from thence to another Place near the great Bath, where he entertain'd himſelf with the Generals of his Army, giving his Orders to them. On the 24th day, his Fever ſtill encreaſing, he would aſſiſt at the Sacrifice, whither he was forced to be carried; and ordered the Generals and other Chief Men to tarry within the Court, and that the Colonels and Captains ſhould keep Guard without the Gates. On the 25th he was carried into one of the inner Apartments of the Caſtle, where he ſlept a little; But his Fever did not diminiſh. When the Generals came to attend him he had already loſt the Uſe of his Tongue, which continued thus on the 26th. The *Macedonians* believing him to be dead, came in a tumultuous manner to the Gates; and having forced thoſe that attended to admit them within the King's Apartment, they all paſſed one by one without their Arms by his Bed. On the ſame day *Python* and *Seleucus* were diſpatch'd to the Temple of *Serapis* to conſult the Oracle whether *Alexander* ſhould be conveyed thither: But they received for Anſwer, that they ſhould not remove *Alexander* from the Place he then was in. On the 28th towards Night he died. Thus it is recorded in the Diary.

12 *It is very probable that the Month* Dæſius *of the* Macedonians *was in the ſame Year coincident with the Month* Thargelion *of the* Athenians

thenians; *of which these are the Words of* Ælianus *(l)*: It is reported also that *Alexander* was born and died on the self-same Day, being the 6th of the Month *Thargelion*.

13. *After the Death of* Alexander, *and many and long Debates among the Generals,* Aridæus *the Son of* Philip, *who also had taken the Name of* Philip, *was by the Majority of Suffrages constituted King, and* Perdiccas, *unto whom* Alexander, *when at the Point of Death, had given his Ring, was chosen Regent; pursuant to which all the Governours of the Provinces and other principal Officers were ordered to obey their Commands. This was done in the same year when* Cephisodorus *was* Archon *of* Athens. Diod. Sic. L. 68.

From these Characters it is evident that Alexander *died in the Spring of the* 4391*st year of the* Julian *Period, Cycl.* ☉. 23. ☽. 2. *and that from the same year, about the Summer Season, when another* Archon *succeeded at* Athens, *the* Philippean *Period had its Beginning.*

To investigate the year since the beginning of these Epoc.

If therefore from any certain year of the Julian *Period given,* 4390 *years and* 3 *Months be subtracted, the Residue shews the year since the Death of* Alexander the Great. *To find out the Year since the Beginning of the* Philippean *Period, several Months more must be subtracted. And if the same Number of Years and Months be added to the year since the Beginning of these Epocha's, the Product will be correspondent to the year of the* Julian *Period.*

About what time Alexander *died.*

§. 1. THere is some Dispute about the true time of the Death of *Alexander the Great.* For *A. Gellius* allots no more than 11 years for the Reign of *Alexander*; whereas

(l) L. 2. c. 35. Var. Hist.

(m) Stra-

(m) *Strabo.* accounts as many after his last Victory obtained against *Darius*. But neither of these two are of sufficient Authority to counterbalance what has been said before concerning the true time of his Death.

How Alexander died.

§. 2. It is also call'd in question whether his Death was occasioned by Poison or Debauchery. Of the first Opinion is (n) *Justin. He was* (says he) *vanquished at last, not by the Bravery of his Enemies, but by the Perfidiousness of his own Friends and Subjects.* And *Curtius* (o) says expressly, *It was believed that his Death was occasioned by Poison*, &c. But (p) *Plutarch* says, that this Account of his being made away by Poison, was look'd upon as a Fiction; because his Body shew'd not the least Marks of it after his Death, tho' it laid several Days exposed to the Heat of the Sun, whilst the Contentions lasted among the Generals.

The Change of Affairs after the Death of Alexander.

§. 3. After the Death of *Alexander* the whole Body of this vast Empire was torn in many Pieces, among which four Kingdoms are the most remarkable, pursuant to the Vision of *Daniel*. For *Ptolemy* seized *Egypt*, *Seleucus Babylon*, *Antigonus* the *Lesser Asia*, and *Antipater Macedonia* and *Greece*.

Who was that Philip that gave the Name to the Philippean Period.

§. 4. The Histories of these Times make Mention of two *Philips*; the first *Philip* the Son of *Amyntas* II. Father to *Alexander the Great*; the second *Aridæus*, the natural Brother of *Alexander*. *Scaliger*, *Christmannus*, *Serarius*, and others attribute the Origin of this Epocha to the first: But the same having been unknown till after the Death of *Alexander the Great* it appears more probable to me, that it owed its first Offspring to *Philip* the Brother of *Alexander*, who was born of *Philinna* a *Thessalian* Lady, and

(m) L. 15. (n) L. 16. c. 16. (o) L. 10. (p) Vit. Alex.

Mis-

Miſtreſs to K. *Philip.* See (*q*) *Diod. Sicul.* For the reſt, the *Philippean* Years were, according to (*r*) *Cenſorinus*, like the *Nabonaſſarean* Years.

CHAP. XXXII.

Of the Epocha of the Seleucides, *which is alſo called the* Græcian *and* Alexandrian *Epocha, and of the* Convenant *and* Therick *DHILCARNAIN, mentioned in the Book of the* Maccabees.

1. *The Epocha of the* Seleucides, *uſed eſpecially among the* Aſiaticks, *owes its Name and Offſpring to* Seleucus; *and has its Beginning at that time when the ſaid* Seleucus *had made himſelf Maſter of* Babylon, *and the Provinces of* Media *and* Suſa.
2. Seleucus *made himſelf Maſter of* Babylon *in the ſame Year that* Polemus *was* Archon *of* Athens.
3. *In the ſame year that the* 117*th Olympiad was celebrated, when* Parmenio *of* Mitylene *got the Victory in the Race.*
4. *In the ſame year that* L. Papyrius *was the* 5*th time, and* C. Junius *the* 2*d time* Roman *Conſuls. All which Characters are related by* (*ſ*) Diod. Siculus.
5. *In the* 148*th year of the* Græcian *Epocha,* Judas *the* Maccabean *did purge the Temple of* Jeruſalem, *after its Prophanation by the* Gen-

(*q*) L. 18. Bibl. (*r*) De D. N. c. 21. (*ſ*) C. 69.

tiles

tiles (a); *which Reſtauration of the Temple happened in the firſt year of the* 145*th* Olympiad, *according to* (b) Joſephus.

6. *The* 150*th year of this ſame Epocha, when* Antiochus Eupator *beſieged* Jeruſalem, *was a* Sabbatick Year (c) (d).

7. *After the Death of* Alexander the Great, Onias *the High-Prieſt ruled at* Jeruſalem; *at which time* Seleucus *having made himſelf Maſter of* Babylon, *reigned ſole Monarch in* Aſia *in the* 12*th year after the Death of* Alexander.

8. *From* Seleucus, *to account backwards to* Cyrus, *are computed* 248 *years. Theſe two Characters are expreſſed in the ſame Words by* (e) Euſebius.

9. *The Year* 1194 *of the Epocha* Therick Dhilcarnain, *which in the* Nurenburg *Edition of* Albategnius, *illuſtrated with Notes by* Joh. Regiomontanus, *is called* ADILCANARI) *was coincident with the* 1206*th year ſince the Death of* Alexander.

10. *The year* 1202 *of the ſame Epocha, in which happened a notable Eclipſe of the Sun, was* 1214 *after the Death of* Alexander, *according to* (f) Mahomet *the Son of* Cruen, *in his Book* de Scien. Stellar. *And it is manifeſt from the Aſtronomical Tables, that the Eclipſe of the year* 1202 *of the Epocha* Therick Dhilcarnain *is coincident with the year of Chriſt* 891, *the* 8*th. day of* Auguſt.

11. *Nothing certain is to be determined concerning the Months of the Years of this Epocha; which are in the firſt Book of the* Maccabees *frequently begun with the Month of* Niſan. *See* 1 Mac. 7. v. 1. c. 9. v. 3. c. 10. v. 1, 21. c. 13. v. 22,

(a) 1 Mac. 4. v. 52, 53. (b) L. 12. c. 11. Ant. (c) 1 Mac. 6. v. 53. (d) Joſ. L. 12. c. 14. (e) L. 8. c. 2. demon. Evang. (f) C. 27. 10.

41. c. 16. v. 14. *But in the 2d Book of the* Maccabeans, *and those of the* Jewish *Historians, from the Month of* Tisri.

From whence it appears, that the Beginning of this Epocha is coincident with the year of the Julian *Period* 4402. *Cycl.* ☉. 6. ☽. 13. *and that the Author of the first Book of the* Maccabeans *speaks for the most part of the Vernal Season of this year; in the 2d of the Autumnal.*

Any certain year given of the Jul. *Period to find out the year since the beginning of this Epocha.*

If therefore 4401 *years and* 3 *Months be subtracted from any certain year of the* Julian *Period, the Residue shews the year since the Beginning of the* Græcian *Epocha, according to the first Book of the* Maccabeans: *And if* 4401 *Years and* 9 *Months be subtracted in the same manner, the Residue will be equivalent to the Number of years since the Beginning of the same Epocha, according to the 2d Book of the* Maccabeans.

Who was Seleucus *that gave Birth to this Epocha.*

§. 1. (g) *Justin* relates that this *Seleucus* was the Son of *Apollo* and *Laodice*. After the Death of *Alexander the Great*, when his Empire was divided among the Generals of his Army, this *Seleucus* had *Syria* for his share; but being forced from thence by King *Antigonus* he sought for Shelter by *Ptolemy* King of *Egypt*; till returning at the Head of a considerable Army, he made himself Master of *Babylon*, in Remembrance of which this Epocha was instituted.

The Jews *call this Epocha the Æra of the* Covenant *or* Principalities.

§. 2. The *Jews* call this Epocha the *Æra of Contracts* or *Covenant*, or the *Æra of Principalities*; because, as they say, when *Alexander the Great*, after he had made himself Master of *Persia*, marched towards *Jerusalem* with an Intention to destroy that City, he was met by the High-

(g) Lib. 15.

Priest

Priest *Simon*, who otherwise is called *Jaddus*; who having prevailed with him to alter his Intentions, upon this Condition, that all the Sons of the Priests that were born in the same year should be called *Alexanders*. This Epocha was from thence called the Epocha of *Contracts* or *Covenants*; as may be seen in *Wilhelmus Schickardus*, who in his Preface to the *Tarich of the* Persian *Kings*, alledges the Words of *Rabbi Abraham* the Levite. But (*b*) *Petavius* deservedly ridicules the Ignorance of the *Jewish* Interpreters, who pretend that the Beginning of this Epocha was at the time when *Alexander* had made himself Master of *Asia*; whereas the same did not arise till 12 years after his Death, and 18 years after his Interview with the High-Priest. For which Reason I prefer the Opinion of those who call this Epocha the Æra of *Principalities*; because after the Death of *Alexander* his Empire was divided into many Principalities.

§. 3. The *Arabians* called this Epocha of *Seleucus*, *Therick Dhilcarnain*, and the *Greeks* ἀπὸ τῶν δικέρων, which signifies as much as the Horned Epocha. *Christmannus* is of Opinion that the *Arabians* and *Greeks* have called *Alexander* the Horned, as being Monarch both of Orient and Occident. *Wilhelmus Schickardus* and others maintain that he was called thus, because he vanquished *Darius Codomannus*, who by (*i*) *Daniel* is compared to a Ram. But *Scaliger's* Opinion seems to be preferr'd before the rest, who derives this Denomination from thence, that *Alexander* was reputed the true Son of *Jupiter Ammon*, and the supposititious Son of *Philip*: For, according to *Schickardus* himself, the *Arabians* used to call those that pimped for their Wives, and

This Epocha is called Therick Dhilcarnain *by the* Arabians.

(*b*) L. 10, de Doct. Temp. c. 42. (*i*) C. 8.

educated Baſtards under the Pretence of their own Children, HORN-BEASTS.

Whether the Author of the 2 Book of the Maccabeans *begins always theſe Years from the Month* Tiſri.

§. 4. *Joſeph Scaliger* and *(k) Dionyſius Petavius* maintain that the Author of the 2d Book of the *Maccabeans* conſtantly begins the Years of this Epocha with the Month *Tiſri*; but it being ſaid in the 2d Book of the *(l) Maccabeans* that it was decreed that the 13th Day of the 12th Month ſhould be celebrated; which Month is called in the *Syrian* Tongue *ADAR*; this contradicts the Opinion of *Scaliger* and *Petavius*. For, if at that time the Month of *ADAR* was the laſt, it follows, that the Month of *NISAN* was the firſt, they beginning their Year with the Spring. For the reſt, thoſe Authors who mention this Epocha, make uſe ſometimes of the *Nabonaſſarean* Years, ſometimes of the *Julian* Years; of which ſee *(m) Dionyſius Petavius*.

CHAP. XXXIII.

Of the Epocha and time of the Aſmoneans, *who were afterwards called* Maccabeans.

1. *This Epocha muſt be regulated according to the true Succeſſion of* Mattathias, Judas Maccabeus, Jonathan, Simon, *&c. as expreſſed in the Books of the* Maccabeans, *and by* Joſephus.
2. Mattathias *began to be famous about that time when* Antioc. Epiphan. *tyrannized over the* Jews *(n)*.

(k) L. 10. c. 43. de Doct. Temp. (l) C. 15. v. 37. (m) L. 10. c. 40 de Doct. Temp. (n) 1 Mac. 2.

3. The

3. *The same* Mattathias *died in the* 146*th year of the* Græcian *Epocha* (*a*).
4. *In the* 148*th year of the same Epocha*, Judas Maccabeus *Son of* Mattathias, *rendred himself famous by restoring the Levitical Service among the* Jews (*b*).
5. *In the* 152*d year of the* Græcian *Epocha* Jud. Maccab. *was slain in the Battle fought against* Bacchides, *and was succeeded by his Brother* Jonathan (*c*).
6. Jonathan *being murdered by the Treachery of* Tryphon, (*d*) Simon *his Brother was made Prince over the* Jews, *and fought with such Success against the* Gentiles, *that it was under his Government said of the* Jews, (*e*) In the 170th Year the *Israelites* were delivered from the Yoke imposed upon them by the Heathens: And from that time on they used to write in their Inscriptions, IN THE FIRST YEAR OF SIMON THE CHIEF HIGH-PRIEST, GENERAL AND PRINCE OF THE JEWS.
7. *The* 172*d year of the* Græcian *Epocha was coincident with the* 3*d year of* Simon *the* Chief High-Priest(*f*).
8. *The Epocha of* Simon *began with the Ecclesiastical Year, or in the Spring* (*g*).
9. *The last of the* Asmonean *Race was* Antigonus *the Son of* Aristobulus *the Brother of* Hyrcanus, *whom* Antonius *caused to be nailed to the Cross (which was the first Instance of that kind of Execution of a King among the* Romans) *and after he had been well scourged, to be strangled. See* (*h*) Jos. *and* (*i*) Dio.

(*a*) 1 Mac. 2. v. 70. (*b*) 1 Mac 4. v. 52. (*c*) 1 Mac. 9. v. 3. 18. 28. (*d*) 1 Mac. 12. v 48. (*e*) 1 Mac. 13. v. 41, 42. (*f*) 1 Mac. 14. v. 27. (*g*) 1 Mac. 13. v. 41. C. 14. v. 27. (*h*) L. 14. Antiqu. c 29. (*i*) L. 49.

10. *The Government of the* Asmoneans, *till the Death of* Antigonus, *lasted* 126 *years*; *and was succeeded by* Herodes, *sirnamed the* Great. *See* (*k*) Jos. *and* (*l*) Hegesippus.

From these Characters it is evident that the Asmonean *Race flourished about the year of the* Julian *Period* 4548, *Cycl.* ☉. 12. ☽. 7. *at which time* Mattathias *died*: *That in the* 4549*th year of the* Julian *Period* Jud. Maccab. *acquired immortal Glory among the* Jews, *by restoring their publick Service*; *and that he was slain in the year of the* Julian *Period* 4555: *And lastly, that the Epocha of* Simon *had its Beginning in the year* 4571 *of the* Julian *Period.*

How to find out any year of these Epocha's.

How any certain year of the Julian *Period may be conveniently connected with the years of these Epocha's, is sufficiently evident from what has been said upon this Point in the preceding Chapters, to wit, for the year since the Death of* Mattathias, *must be subtracted* 4547 *years*; *for the year since the Restauration of the Levitical Service by* Judas, 4548 *years*; *and for the year of the Epocha instituted in honour of* Simon, *must be subtracted* 4570 *years and three Months*, &c.

The Derivation of the Name of the Asmoneans.

§. 1. THE Words of *Josephus*, where he relates the Family of *Mattathias* being ambiguous, some have made the Word *Asmonean* a proper Name, others an Appellative. It is, I think sufficient for us to know that the Word *Asmonean* signifies as much in the *Hebrew* as *Great Men* and *Governours*; in which Sence it is explained by *Rabbi Kimchi.*

(*k*) L. 14. c. ult. L. 15. c. 1. Ant. L. 1. c. 13. de Bel. Jud. (*l*) L. 1. c. 3. de Excid. Hierosol.

§. 2.

§ 2. Many who insist upon the Promise of the Scepter of *Judah*, would have the *Asmoneans* descended from the Tribe of *Judah*; of which Opinion are *Genebrardus* and *Baronius*: But the last of these two has changed his Opinion in his last Edition of his Annals, it being evident out of the Books of the *Maccabeans* (*m*), that the *Asmonean* Family was descended from the Tribe of *Levi*; which is likewise agreeable to the Genealogy of *Josephus* (*n*). What is alledged by some of the *Asmonean* Race to be descended on the Mother's side from the Family of *David*, is of no great Consequence, it being not customary among the *Jews*, to let the Succession pass to the Females. *Of which Tribe the* Asmoneans *were descended.*

§. 3. *Judas* the Son of *Mattathias* was the first who was sirnamed the *Maccabean* (*o*): But concerning the Interpretation of this Word there are diverse Opinions. (*p*) *Johan. Reuchlinus* and *Serrarius* would have it to have been an Inscription in the great Standard of *Judah*, and to signifie as much as WHO IS LIKE UNTO THE LORD AMONGST THE GODS? And that *Judas* from thence had received the Sirname of *Maccabean*. But (*q*) *Fullerus* interprets it, THROUGH ME IS THE PLAGUE, to wit, in Reference of the refractory Gentiles and Apostates. *How they were called* Maccabeans *afterwards.*

§. 4. Many Learned Men are of Opinion, that the supreme Administration of the Government among the *Jews* was not lodged in the Tribe of *Levi* till the time of the *Asmonean* Family, but contrary to Truth: For (*r*) *Josephus* says expressly, that after the Return of the *Jews* to *Jerusalem* by the Command of *The Administration of the Government was in the Tribe of* Levi *before the* Asmoneans.

(*m*) 1 Mac. 2. v. 1. c. 14. v. 29. (*n*) L. 12. c. 8. (*o*) 1 Mac. 2. v. 3. (*p*) L. 3. Art. Cab. (*q*) L. 2. 13. misc. (*r*) L. 20. c. 8.

Cyrus, *Jesus* the Son of *Josedec* was High-Priest; *WHO*, says he, *AND WHOSE POSTERITY*, in all Fifteen, governed the *Jewish* 'Commonwealth till the time of *Antiochus* '*Eupator*. St. *Jerome* (*s*) consents with *Josephus*, and (*t*) *Lyra* has the following Words: 'God 'governed his People after they had taken 'Possession of the Land of Promise, by three 'different Forms of Government: First, by the 'Judges, of which in the Book of the Judges. 'Secondly, by the Kings, of which in the Book 'of the Kings. Thirdly, by the High-Priests, 'from their Return out of the *Babylonian* Cap-'tivity, till Christ. And it is remarkable what is related by (*u*) *Josephus*, that when *Alexander the Great* stood in need of the Assistance of the *Jews* at the Siege of *Tyrus*, he directed his Letters written for that Purpose to *Jaddua* the then High-Priest.

CHAP. XXXIV.

Of the Antiochian Epocha *or* χρηματισμὸς ἡ Ἀντιοχείας.

The Chief Characters of the *Antiochian* Epocha are,

1. *The Beginning of this Epocha is coincident with that time when the Battle of* Pharsalia *was fought; where* Pompey*'s Army was put to an entire Rout, and he himself slain soon after through the Perfidiousness of* Septimus, Salvius, *and* Achillus.

(*s*) In Jer. c. 22. in Ez. c. 21. (*t*) In C. 1. Ez. (*u*) L. 11. c. 8.

2. *The*

2. *The* 2*d year of the Reign of the Emperour* Leo *was the* 5506*th* χρηματιζόντος πόλεως, *in which year, to wit, on the fourth day of the Month* Gorpiæus (*the ſame with the Month of* September *by the* Romans) *happned a great Earthquake, which ſhook almoſt all the Houſes of the New City, according to* (*a*) Evagrius.

3. *In the* 150*th year of this Epocha, under the Reign of* Trajan *there happned another moſt terrible Earthquake, mentioned by the ſame* Evagrius.

4. *In the* 5754*th year of this Epocha, on the firſt day of the Month of* Xanticus (*our firſt of* April) *the Emperour* Juſtin *being at the Point of Death, conſtituted* Juſtinian, *his Siſter's Son, his Conſort in the Empire, according to the ſame* (*b*) Evagrius.

5. *The firſt year of this Epocha is coincident with the* 1969*th year of* Abraham. Euſeb. *Upon which year* Euſebius *ſpeaks concerning the* Antiochian *Computation.*

6. *In the ſame firſt year of this Epocha began likewiſe the firſt* INDICTION, *which was followed afterwards by others, as it is well obſerved by* Scaliger; *ſo that the* Antiochian *Years divided by* 15, *the Reſidue ſhews the true Character of the* Cycle of Indictions.

From theſe and other Characters, but eſpecially thoſe remarked by Evagrius, *it may be concluded that this Æra began in the year of the* Julian *Period* 4665, *Cycl.* ☉. 17. ☽. 10. *in Autumn.*

If therefore 4664 *Years and* 9 *Months be ſubſtracted from any certain year of the* Julian *Period, the Reſidue ſhews the year ſince the Beginning of the* Antiochian Epocha.

Any certain year given of the Julian *Period to find out the year ſince the Beginning of this Epocha.*

(*a*) L. 2. c. 12. (*b*) L. 4. c. 9.

This Epocha began in Autumn.

§ 1. IN the Chronicle of *Alexandria* it is observed that Liberty was proclaimed at *Antiochia* on the 20th day of *May*; which, if it be ſo, it follows, that the Epocha of the *Antiochian* Liberty had its Beginning before the Battle fought betwixt *Caſar* and *Pompey*; The Battle of *Pharſalia* being, according to the Teſtimony (*c*) of *Caſar* himſelf, fought when it was near Harveſt-time: But moſt of the beſt Chronologers agree in this point, that this Epocha had its Beginning, not in the Spring, but in the Autumn next preceding the Battle of *Pharſalia*: For which Reaſon *Scaliger* and *Calviſius* appoint the firſt day of *October* for the Beginning of this Epocha, which, in my Opinion, would have been better on the 22d of *September*, this having been anciently the Beginning of the *Indictions*.

Why this Epocha is called Χρηματισμὸς τ Αντιοχείας ἀπὸ τ αὐτονομίας αὐτῆς.

§. 2. *John Chriſtopherſon* an *Engliſhman*, a famous Interpreter of the ancient *Grecians*, has tranſlated the Words of *Evagrius*, where he makes mention of Χρηματισμὸς; *in the Year in which* Antiochia *received its Name*; but quite beyond the Purpoſe; *Antiochia* having received its Name above 260 Years before this Epocha, from *Antiochus*; beſides that the *Greek* Word does not admit of this Explication. The Opinion therefore of *Scaliger* appears moſt probable, that thereby they had a Reſpect to the Cycle of *Indictions*, which was begun with the firſt Year of this Epocha.

(*c*) L. 3. B. G.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXXV.

Of the Julian *Epocha.*

The *Julian* Epocha begins with the Correction of the *Calendar*, which was begun,

1. *When* Cæſar, *then High-Pontiff, was the third time, and* Em. Lepidus *Conſuls of* Rome, *according to* (a) Cenſ. *and* Dio.
2. *The* Julian *Years owe their Offspring to the 4th Conſulſhip of* Cæſar, *according to the ſame* Cenſ. Loc. Cit.
3. *The* 283*d* Julian *Year is coincident with the ſame Year that* Ulpius *and* Ponticanus *were Conſuls at* Rome, *and with the Year ſince the Building of the City* 991, *according to* Cenſ. Cap. 21.

From whence we conclude that the firſt Julian *Year began on the firſt of* January, *in the Year of the* Julian *Period* 4669, *Cycl.* ☉. 21. ☽. 14. *and that conſequently the preceding* 4663*th Year was the Year of Confuſion.*

If therefore 4668 *years be ſubtracted from any certain given year of the* Julian *Period, the Reſidue ſhews the year ſince the Beginning of this Epocha. And if to the Year of this Epocha the before-mentioned Number of Years be added, the Product eaſily ſhews the Year of the* Julian *Period.*

Any certain year given of the Jul. Period *to find out the year ſince the beginning of this Epocha.*

(a) C. 2. De Die Nat.

§. 1.

Why Cæsar altered the Form of the Year.

§. 1. *Julius Cæsar* finding that the Pontiffs of *Rome*, whose Care it was to intercalate the Years which were to be *Lunæ-Solar* Years, had abused their Authority, and managed this Intercalation according to their own Convenience, and to oblige their Friends according as they were inclined to lay down, sooner or later, their Magistracies, resolved to correct this Corruption: Of which see *Censorinus*.

How this was effected.

§. 2. (*b*) *Ammianus Marcellinus* gives an Account at large how *Cæsar* proceeded in the Correction of the Old Calendar; The Sum and whole Basis of which is, That *Sosigenes* did make the *Solar Tropick* Year consist of 365 Days and 6 Hours; but that the 6 Hours were not to be accounted, till (all together) they made up one Day, which was to be added to the 4th Year, on the 22d of *February*; so that this Interval of 48 Hours was to be accounted for one and the same Day. Of which see also *Celsus*.

How the Months were ordered in the Julian *Year.*

§. 3. The Year of *Romulus* began with the Month of *March*, according to the Poet:

Martis erat primus mensis, Veneriſque ſecundus,
Hæc generis princeps, ipſius ille pater.
Tertius à Senibus, Juvenum de nomine quartus,
Quæ ſequitur numero turba vocata fuit.

But under the Reign of *Numa Pompilius* the *Romans* were pleased to add the two Months of *January* and *February*; so that *January* was the first; of which the Poet has the following Words:

(*b*) Lib. 26. Rer. Gest.

Pri-

Primus erat Jani menſis, quia janua prima eſt,
Qui ſacer eſt imis manibus, imus erat.
Poſtmodo creduntur ſpatio diſtantiu longo
Tempora bis quini continuaſſe viri.

At the time of *Julius Cæſar* therefore the ſame Order was obſerved in the Months which is retained to this day.

§. 4. The Motive that induced *Cæſar* to begin the *Julian* Year with the firſt of *January*, or the *Hybernal Solſtice* is thus repreſented by the Poet: *Why Cæſar began the Year with the firſt of January.*

Dic age frigoribus, quare novus incipit annus,
Qui melius per Ver incipiendus erat?
Omnia tunc florent, tunc & nova temporis ætas,
Et nova de gravido palmite gemma tumet, &c.

After having ſaid much more in Praiſe of the Spring, the Poet makes this Anſwer:

Bruma novi prima eſt, veteriſque noviſſima Solis,
Principium capiunt Phœbus & annus idem.

§. 5. The Year which preceded the firſt *Julian* Year was called the *Year of Confuſion*; becauſe it conſiſted, by reaſon of the Neglect of the Intercalations, of 15 Months or 445 Days, as is evident from the Words of *Cenſorinus*. *Cæſar*, ſays he, *when High-Pontiff of* Rome, *in his third Conſulſhip, and in the firſt of* Emil. Lepidus, *to correct what had been neglected before, intercalated two Months conſiſting of 67 Days, betwixt the Months of* November *and* December, *having already added 23 Days to the Month of* February, *and this made that Year to conſiſt of* 445 *Days.* And (c) *Suetonius* repreſents the Co- *Of the Year of Confuſion.*

(c) Vit. Cæſ.

rection

rection of *Cæsar* in the same manner; from all which it is evident that the *Year of Confusion* began on the 14th day of *October*, in the Year of the *Julian* Period 4667.

The Correction of the Julian *Years.*

§. 6. Though *Cæsar* had been very careful in appointing the exact time of Intercalation; yet *Cæsar* having been slain in the second year of this Epocha, out of Ignorance of those who had the Management of the Calendar, these Intercalations were made sooner than it ought to have been; which induced *Octavius Augustus* to undertake the Reformation of these *Julian* Years, which is thus related by *Macrobius*: *The Priests*, says he, *have given Occasion to a new Error by their Intercalations. For, whereas they ought to have intercalated that Day which is made up out of four times 6 Hours, at the latter End of each 4th year, at the Beginning of the 5th; they did make this Intercalation at the Beginning of each 4th year. This erroneous Intercalation was continued for 36 years together; in which time 12 Days were intercalated instead of 9. This Mistake was likewise corrected by* Augustus, *who ordered that the 12 next following years should not be intercalated; that these three Days, which, by the Over-hastiness of the Priests, were introduced, might be swallowed up thus in this Interval. Afterwards he ordered (pursuant to* Cæsar's *Intention) that at the Beginning of each 5th year one Day should be intercalated; and that this should (for an everlasting Remembrance) be cut in Brass.*

Whether the Julian *Years need another Correction.*

§. 7. It is undeniable, that there is some Mutation in the Ingress of the Sun into the Celestial Points; and that likewise the Feasts of *Easter* have been misplaced in the Old Calendar. Nevertheless I cannot see any sufficient Reason which should induce us to approve of the *Gregorian* Correction or any other; but rather to retain the ancient Form of the Year, as in the times of *Julius Cæsar*, and without cutting off

Day, by reason of the Preceding *Equinoxes*, to investigate the *Plenilunium Paschale* out of the most exact Astronomical Tables; and to fix the Feast of *Easter* on the first *Feria* next ensuing the said *Plenilunium*, thus following the Footsteps of both the Emperours *Julius* and *Constantine*. For it is well known, that the first regulated the Publick and Civil *Records* according to the Motion of the Sun, in which he followed the Opinion of *Sosigenes*, and his Solar Year. We have before us the Examples of many great *Mathematicians*, and of *Ptolemy* himself, who did not reject the *Fasti Nabonassarei*; tho' in the same no Account was made of the Hours belonging to the Solar Year; and what should move us to pretend to any new Alterations in the *Julian* Calendar, which agrees much more with the Celestial Motions? For, what Detriment is it to the Commonwealth, if the *Equinox* be fixed now on the 9th or 10th Day of *March*, which, in the times of *Julius Cæsar* used to fall out upon the 23d Day of the same Month? On the other hand, what a Confusion would it be, if by rejecting the *Julian* Year we should be put under a Necessity of rendring useless all the *Astronomical Tables* and the *Julian* Period? For which Reason it is, that *Johannes Keplerus*, who was Mathematician to three Emperours, when he compiled his *Tabulas Rudolphinas*, did not follow the Method of *Gregorius*, but retained the *Julian* Computation: Neither need we (like *Gregorius*) be at the Charge of many thousand Pounds to find out the *Paschal Plenilunes*; the same being without great Difficulty to be investigated out of the Astronomical Tables, where the *Equinoxes* and *Plenilunes* have their exact appointed times. To be short, as the Church does not impair the Civil Power, so the Feasts need not interfere with the Imperial Records; especially

at

at this time when we may make use of the Words of the (a) Apostle, *Let no Man judge you in respect of any Holy Day, or the New Moon, or of the Sabbath-Days, which are a Shadow of things to come.*

CHAP. XXXVI.

Of the Epocha *of the time of* Herod *and the Reigns of the Foreign Kings over the* Jews.

1. Herod, *who afterwards was sirnamed* the Great, *was by* Antipater *declared Prince of* Galilea, *when he was scarce* 15 *years of Age.* (b) Josephus.
2. *This was done after* Julius Cæsar *had put a happy Period to the* Alexandrian *War, and had conferr'd great Honours upon* Antipater *the Father of* Herod. (c) Jos.
3. *This same* Herod *solliciting for Succours against the* Parthians, *was by* Anthony *and* Augustus, *with Consent of the Senate and People of* Rome, *declared King of* Judæa *in the* 184*th Olympiad, when* C. Domit. Calv. *the second time, and* C. Asin. Pollio *were Consuls of* Rome, *whose Consulate was coincident with the Year before Christ* 40, *according to the vulgar Epocha. See* (d) Jos.
4. *The City of* Jerusalem *was besieged and taken by* Herod *and* Sosius *in the Sabbatick Year, when* M. Agrippa *and* Canid. Gallus *were Consuls at* Rome *in the* 185*th Olympiad, in the*

(a) Col. 2. v. 16, 17. (b) L. 14. c. 17. Antiq. L. 1. c. 8. de Bell. Jud. (c) L. 14. c. 15. 17. Ant. (d) L. 19. v. 26.

third

third Month, on the Day of their great and solemn Fast; on which Day the said City was likewise taken by Pompey *27 years before. See* (*e*) Josephus. *These Characters shew the taking of this City to have been coincident with the 37th year before Christ.*

5. *The Battle betwixt* Anthony *and* Augustus *was fought near the Promontory of* Actium *in the 7th year after* Herod *had taken the City of* Jerusalem, *according to* Josephus (*f*); *which Battle happned in the 31st year before Christ, and in the 15th* Julian *Year, as shall be shewn hereafter.*

6. Herod *was confirmed in the Kingdom, and had the Crown, which he had laid down of his own accord, restored to him, when* Augustus *marched into* Egypt, *which was in the 2d year after the Battle of* Actium, *and the 30th year before Christ.*

7. Herod *lived but eight Days* (Josephus *says five*) *after he had caused his Son* Antipater *to be slain. He reigned in all forty years.* Chron. Temp. Sec.

8. *The 18th year of the Reign of* Herod *was the 15th year after he taking the City of* Jerusalem, *and in the same year he began to rebuild the Temple which he had caused to be pulled down before. See* (*g*) Josephus.

9. *The Days that* Herod *reigned over all the* Jews *are 37 years, and* Herod *died; a Man who had been very prosperous in his Undertakings. These are the Words of the* Hebrew *Text of* (*h*) Josephus, *translated by* Sebastianus Munsterus *from the* Constantinopolitan *Copy, and published by* Hen. Petrus *in the year* 1540 *at* Basil. *For the true time of the Beginning of the Reign of* Herod *over all the* Jews *must be computed from his taking the City of* Jerusalem.

(*e*) L. 14. c. 18. Ant. (*f*) L. 15. c. 10. (*g*) L. 17. c. 10. Ant. (*h*) L. 5. c. 41.

10.

10. *When* Herod's *Recovery was despaired of,* Judas Sariphæus *and* Matthias Margalothus *made their Attempt upon the Golden Eagle; for which they and their Adherents were burnt alive: And in the same Night hapned a Lunar Eclipse, and the King grew worse. See* (*i*) Josephus. *Another such Eclipse hapned a year before the vulgar Epocha of Christ.*

11. *The Tyrant died not many Months before the Feast of the Passover: For* Archelaus, *who, by the last Will of* Herod *was appointed his Successour in the Kingdom, did engage at the time of the Feast of the Passover with those that were risen in Rebellion to revenge the Death of* Matthias *and his Friends; of whom, after he had slain several thousands, he ordered that all such as by reason of the Feast were come to* Jerusalem, *should return to their Homes. See* (*k*) Josephus.

12. *Our Saviour's Birth, and the Murder of the Children of* Bethlem *under two years of Age, of which mention is made in* (*l*) Matthew, *hapned before the Death of* Herod.

13. Archelaus, *before he had reigned quite 9 years, was despoiled of the Kingdom, and banish'd into* France; (*m*) *after which,* Judæa, *from being a Kingdom, being annexed to the Province of* Syria, Quirinus *or* Cyrenus *was sent thither as Governour, to take their Inhabitants, and to dispose of the private Estate of* Archelaus. Quirinus *brought along with him* Coponius *a Commander of a Body of Horse, unto whom he left the Administration of Affairs in* Judæa (*n*). *It was in the 37th year after the Battle of* Actium, *and the taking of* Alexandria (*o*), *that this Taxation was made, which is coincident with the 7th or 8th year of the vulgar Æra of Christ.*

(*i*) L. 17. c. 8. (*k*) L. 17. c. 11. (*l*) c. 2. v. 16. (*m*) Jos. l. 2. c. 6. de Bell. Jud. (*n*) Jos. l. 17. c. 1. (*o*) Jos. l. 18. c. 3.

As-

According to these Characters we conclude that the time of Herod *is to be regulated in the following manner. He was made Prince of* Galilea *about the year of the* Julian *Period* 4667. 2. *He was declared King at* Rome *in the Year of the* Jul. *Period* 4674. 3. *He conquered* Jerusalem *in the year of the* Jul. *Period* 4684. 4. Augustus *confirmed his Reign in the year of the* Jul. *Period* 4684. 5. *He rebuilt the Temple of* Jerusalem *about the year of the* Jul. *Period* 4690. 6. *He died in the year of the* Jul. *Period* 4713. *before the Feast of the Passover.* 7. *His Successor was banished about the year of the* Jul. *Period* 4721.

If therefore any certain year of the Julian *Period be given, subtract from that year for the Beginning of the Princely Dignity of* Herod 4666 *years; for the Beginning of his Reign* 4673 *years; for his Conquest of* Jerusalem 4676 *years; for his being confirmed in the Kingdom by* Augustus 4683 *years; for the Rebuilding of the Temple* 4690 *years; for his Death* 4713 *years; for the Banishment of* Archelaus 4720 *years. And if the same Numbers which have been subtracted, be added to the several years known by the Residues, the Products will be correspondent to the years of the* Jul. *Period.*

§. 1. NIch. *Damascenus* who was a familiar Friend of *Herod* himself, traces his Origin from the *Babylonian Jews*; which, tho' it has been contradicted by *Josephus*, yet has been embraced by the Author of the *Hebrew* History cited by (p) *Drusius*, and amongst the Christians by *Torniellus*, *Africanus*, *Eusebius*, *Baronius*, *Serrarius*, and others, deduce his Origin from the *Philistian* of *Ascalon*; but *Josephus* makes *Herod* an *Idumean*; *Of the Family of Herod.*

(p) Ad Sulp. Severr. p. 250.

which is a Demi-Jew; the *Idumeans*, who were conquered by *Joh. Hircanus* having embraced the *Jewish* Religion, which being the most probable Opinion, is likewise confirmed by the Testimony of the Author of the Chronicle of the 2d Temple.

Herod was made Governour of Galilee in the 15th year of his Age.

§. 2. *Jos. Scaliger*, *Keplerus*, *Torniellus*, *Spanhemius*, *Langius*, and almost all the modern Chronologers accuse *Josephus* of a notable Error in appointing the 15th year of *Herod's* Age when he was made Prince of *Galilee* by his Father *Antipater*; in lieu of which they would have it 25 or 26 years. But the Circumstances of the whole History sufficiently evince that *Josephus* did commit no Mistake in putting 15 instead of 25. The only Objection is, that according to *Josephus* himself, *Herod* was but 15 years old at the time of the *Alexandrian* War, and the Beginning of the *Julian* Epocha; and in the 45th year of the *Julian* Epocha, when he died, he is said to have been 70 years old. To which it is to be answered, That the Word γεγὼς, made use of by *Josephus*, may be taken here for one of above 60 years old; or else, that the Text is adulterated in this Passage, rather than contradict so many unquestionable Circumstances relating to this History.

When Herod *died.*

§. 3. The true time of the Death of *Herod* is involved in no small Difficulties. *Jobi Kepl. Dion. Petav.* and *Fred. Spanhem.* refer his Death to the 42d *Julian* Year, to wit, three years sooner than has been asserted by us: But *Herod* having received the Royal Diadem in the 6th *Julian* Year after the Feast of the Passover, from thence to the 42d *Julian* Year cannot be computed more than 35 years; whereas *Josephus* expressly mentions 37 years. Furthermore, if *Herod* be supposed to have died in the 42d *Julian* Year, it must follow, that our Saviour was born in the 41st *Julian* Year; from whence, to the 74th *Julian* Year,

Year, which is coincident with the 15th year of the Reign of *Tiberius*, are about 33 years; which, according this Hypothesis, must have been the Age of our Saviour; which is contradicted by (q) St. *Luke*: and, to affirm, that *Herod* died before the Birth of Christ, is contrary to the Evangelical History.

What Reasons are alledged against our Opinion.

§. 4. Those before-mention'd Authors, who anticipate the Death of *Herod* three years before us, alledge in their behalf the Text of *Josephus*, which mentions not only 37 years for the Reign of *Herod*, but also attributes compleat 9 years for *Archelaus* after the Death of *Herod*. If, say they, the Coronation of *Herod* hapned in the 6th *Jul.* Year, from thence to the 42d *Jul.* year when *Herod* died, are 36 years. And, if from the 51st *Julian* Year when *Æmilius Lepidus* and *C. Arun. Nepos* were Consuls at *Rome*; and which, according to (r) *Dio Cassius*, hapned the Banishment of *Archelaus*, the 9 years of his Reign be subtracted, the Residue is correspondent to the 42d *Julian* Year, when *Archelaus* succeeded his Father. This, they say, appears further out of the Computation of the Years of *Philip* the younger Son of *Herod*. The 37th year of his Age, which was his last, is made coincident by (s) *Josephus* with the 20th year of the Reign of *Tiberius*; but the 20th year of the Reign of *Tiberius* began in *September* in the 78th *Julian* Year; of which, if the 36 years of *Philip* be subtracted, the Residue is again correspondent to the 42d *Julian* Year, when *Philip* succeeded his Father *Herod* in some Part of the Kingdom. It cannot be denied that this Computation carries along with it a great Probability, if the same were also agreeable to the other before-mentioned Characters. According to this Hypothesis, the whole Series

(q) C. 3. v. 1, 23 (r) L. 5 (s) L. 18. c 6.

of the History of the *Jews* must be called in question, or else that *Josephus* was only misguided in the Relation of the History of *Herod*; or else, that these Errors are crept in by the Negligence of the Transcribers. But the safest way is to keep to these Characters mentioned at the Beginning of this Chapter, and not to reject these Demonstrations for the sake of some Niceties.

Some refer the Death of Herod to the 43d Julian Year.

§. 5. *Laurent. Suslyga* and *Is. Vossius* refer the Death of *Herod* to the 43d *Julian* Year, or to the year of the *Jul.* Period 4711: But besides what has been alledged before against *Keplerus* and *Petavius*, it is to be observed that these two have made but little Reflection upon the Character of the *Lunar* Eclipse mentioned by *Josephus*.

Some to the 44th year.

§. 6. *Alstedius*, *Wilhelmus Langius*, and *Wickmannus*, make the Death of *Herod* coincident with the 43d *Julian* Year, or the year of the *Jul.* Period 4712; by which means they pretend to come nearer to the 37 years appropriated by *Josephus* to the Reign of *Herod*: But since this Opinion labours under the same Difficulty with the former, in respect of the Eclipse of the Moon, I choose rather to follow the Opinion of *Scaliger*, than to grapple in the Dark when it is left to my Choice to walk in the Light.

Unto what time the Lunar Eclipse is to be referred.

§. 7. The Celestial Characters having been always considered as the surest Guides for the Chronologers, most of those Authors who dispute about the true time of the Death of *Herod*, have endeavoured to bring that notable Eclipse of the Moon mentioned by (*t*) *Josephus*, within the Compass of their several Hypotheses. *Laurentius Codomannus* (*u*) has the following Words of this Eclipse: 'In the year of the World 4133,

(*t*) L. 17. c. 8. Ant. (*u*) An. S. Script. p. 69.

'little

little before Midnight which followed the 8th day of *November*, in the 2d year of Christ, happened that Eclipse of the Moon mentioned by *Josephus* in the 17th Book and 8th Chapter. The next following day being the 9th day of *November*, *Herod the Great* being then very ill, *&c.* *Tho. Lydiott* maintains that this same Eclipse happened in the Beginning of the Night which followed the 20th day of *February* of the 52d *Julian* Year. *Joh. Keplerus*, and *Dion. Petavius* declare for that Eclipse of the Moon which happened on the 13th day of *March*, 2 Hours and 45 Minutes after Midnight. (x) *Joh. Georg. Herwart ab Hohenburg* in his *New and Truly Astronomical Chronology*, makes this Eclipse the same with that which happened in the 47th *Jul.* Year, and the 754th year since the Building of *Rome*, according to *Varro*'s Computation; when on the 20th day of *February* the Moon was eclipsed an Hour before Midnight, the Sun being at that time in the 29th Degree, 51 Minutes of *Aquarius*. *Wilhelm. Langius* alledges that Eclipse for the true one, which happened in the 44th *Julian* Year in the Morning, on the 20th day of *January*, the End of which was seen at *Arbela*, and the Middle in some more Oriental Parts. But *Scaliger* is of Opinion that the Lunar Eclipse mentioned by *Josephus*, near the time of the Death of *Herod*, happened on the 8th day of *January*, in the 45th *Jul.* Year. Thus has this memorable Character so industriously observed and set down by *Josephus* proved the Apple of Contest among the Chronologers. To give the best Judgment we can in so difficult a Point, it ought to be observed, that those who have bestowed so much Pains in applying these Eclipses to their Hypotheses, have lost much Labour and Time, unless the same be

(x) C. 149. p. 75.

likewiſe agreeable to the other Circumſtances. Thus it may rationally be ſuppoſed that the Lunar Eclipſe mentioned here by *Joſephus* was viſible at *Jeruſalem*, it being mentioned as a peculiar Character belonging to the Hiſtory of the *Jews*; and the Word τὴν νυκτὰ ſeems to intimate that the ſame hapned near Midnight, not in the Evening or Morning, in Oppoſition to *Langius*. It is alſo very probable that the ſame was not ſo inconſiderable as it is made by *Petavius*; but that it was very remarkable and worth the taking notice of by ſo great an Hiſtorian. There is alſo another Circumſtance worth our particular Obſervation; that there muſt be betwixt this Eclipſe and the enſuing Paſſover an Interval ſufficient for the tranſacting all thoſe Matters that are related in that Place by (y) *Joſephus*: *Herod* falling dangerouſly ill after this Eclipſe, conſulted the Phyſicians; and after he had for ſome time uſed their Preſcriptions, he was by their Advice carried to the Bath. After his Return from thence he received Letters from *Rome*; and finding himſelf grow worſe and worſe, he cauſed *Antipater* to be ſlain, and died not till five Days after: After which were celebrated the Funeral Rites with great Pomp, his Corps being carried from *Jericho* to *Herodium* above 200 *Stadia*. After all this had been tranſacted, the Slaughter of ſeveral thouſands enſued at the time of the Paſſover, all which is not probable that it could have been done in ſo few Days as *Keplerus* and *Petavius* allot for this Interval. So that the whole matter duly weighed, *Scaliger*'s Opinion deſerves to be preferr'd before all the others; of which we will give you a Scheme in the following Table:

(y) L. 1. c. 21. de Bell. Jud.

		Hor. Grad.	′	″
Media 8 accidit Uranib.				
tempore Astronom. compl.				
A. Per. Jul. 4712. 8 Jan.		15	40	21
Intervallum inter veram & mediam 8 Subtr.		4	17	24
Tempus apparens veræ 8 Uranib.	8 Jan.	11	22	57
Anomalia Æquin. Sing.	1.	6	31	0
Longit. Solis,	9	16	14	32
Anomal. Solis,	7	8	8	6
Longit. Lunæ.	5	27	49	17
Anom. Lunæ,	7	13	10	19
Latit. Lunæ,	5	26	50	2
Prostaphær. Æq. subtr.			16	10
Prostaph. Solis add.		1	18	0
		Hor	′	″
Prostaph. Lunæ add.		3	28	47
Locus Solis verus in ♑.		17	16	24
Locus Lunæ verus in ♑.		17	16	23
Latit. Lunæ Austral.			1	38
Semidiameter Umbræ,			45	16
Semidiameter Lunæ,			16	49
Pars Lunæ deficiens,			61	30
Digiti Ecliptici 21, Min. 34,				
Motus Lunæ horarius,			32	59
Scrupula Incidentiæ & moræ dimidiæ,			62	4
Tempus Incidentiæ.		1	52	54
Initium Eclipsis Hierosolymis p. merid.	8 Jan.	11	21	17
Medium,		13	14	11
Finis,		15	7	5
Duratio,		3	45	48
Latit. ☽. ad init. Bor.			4	7
Latit. ☽. ad finem Austr.			7	22

§. 8.

Concerning Baronius his Computation of the Reign of Herod.

§. 8. *Baronius* objects against *Josephus* that he has left out nine years in the whole Computation of the years of the Reign of *Herod*. And because it is related by (x) *Josephus*, that he died when he had lived 70 years, and that he had received the Government of *Galilea* in the 15th year of his Age; from whence he concludes, that the 37 years mentioned by *Josephus* ought to begin with that time, when *Augustus* gave him the Title of *King*, being not permitted to reckon the preceding Years among his Reign; and that consequently the first of the 37 years was coincident with the 15 *Julian* Years, in which happened the Battle near *Actium*, when *Augustus* was the third time, and *Messala* Consuls of *Rome*; in the 2d year of the 178th Olympiad: So that the Nativity of Christ hapned at the Beginning of the 29th year of this Epocha; and *Herod*'s Death in the 8th year of Christ. *Tho. Lyddiot* has for the greatest part followed the Footsteps of *Baronius*. But this Opinion is founded upon such Suppositions as are altogether groundless; no Inference being to be made from *Herod*'s being confirmed in the Kingdom by *Augustus*, that he was deprived of the Royal Title and Dignity, before the Phrase *Confirmare aliquem in Regno*, not implying among the *Romans* to create one a King, which is manifest from thence, that *Herod* had before obtained the Royal Dignity by the mutual Consent of *Anthony* and *Augustus* and the Approbation of the Senate.

Concerning the 46 years mentioned in St. Joh. c. 2. v. 20

§. 9. The Words spoken by the *Jews* to our Saviour, *Forty and six years was this Temple in building*, have puzzled the Interpreters, some of whom have explained them of the Temple built by *Zorobabel*; but it is evident from the History

(x) L. 7. c. 8. Ant. L. 14. c. 17. L. 1. c. 21. de Bell. Jud.

of

of *Herod*, that they ſpoke in this Paſſage of the Temple that was rebuilt by *Herod*, which was begun in the 18th year of his Reign and in its Height in the 28th year of his Reign; and not brought to its Perfection till 46 years after the firſt Preparations were made for this great Structure. There is one Objection againſt it, which is, that (*a*) *Joſephus* ſays in another Place, that the Temple of *Herod* was built in 18 Months, which is to be underſtood from its outward Parts, tho' there are alſo ſome who interpret the Interval of 46 years betwixt the 18th year of the Reign of *Herod* and the firſt year after the Baptiſm of Chriſt thus; that the Structure of the Temple was interrupted for ſome time.

Whether mention is made of the Murther of the Children by Herod in prophane Hiſtory.

§. 10. (*b*) *Macrobius* is the only Perſon among the Prophane Hiſtorians, who makes mention of the Murther of the Children by *Herod* in theſe Words: Auguſtus *having underſtood that among the Male Children under two years of Age, which were ſlain in* Syria *by the Command of* Herod *his own Son had been among their Number, he ſaid*, It is much better to be the Hog than the Son of *Herod*. There are not wanting ſuch as look upon this as a meer Fiction. Others refer theſe Words of *Auguſtus* to the Murther of his Son *Antipater*; others to another Son of his under two years of Age, who was ſlain among the reſt at *Bethlehem*; and that *Antipater's* Murther happned after that of the Male Children, which is evident from (*c*) *Euſebius* and (*d*) *Joſephus*; the firſt of which ſays expreſly, that the Murther of the Children of *Bethlehem* was committed before *Herod* fell ill; and the laſt affirms, that *Antipater* was not ſlain till five days before his Death.

(*a*) L. 15. c. 14. Ant. (*b*) L. 2. c. 4. Saturn. (*c*) L. 1. c. 8. Hiſt. Eccleſ. (*d*) L. 7. c. 6, 9. Ant.

Josephus *did not mention this Murther of the Male Children.*

§. 11. *Scaliger* admires what could induce *Josephus* to pass by in Silence this Murther of the Children under two years of Age at *Bethlehem* in the History of *Herod*; which is not only excused, but defended by (*e*) *Isaac Vossius*; who alledges in his Behalf, that after so many Cruelties and Murthers of Wives, Sons, Relations and Friends, committed by *Herod*, *Josephus* looks upon this as so inconsiderable as scarce to deserve a Place in his History. But that this Murther was not so inconsiderable as *Vossius* would persuade us is sufficiently testified by (*f*) St. *Matthew* in the following Words: Herod *slew all the Children that were at* Bethlehem, *and in all the Coasts thereof, from two years old and under*, &c. *Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by* Jeremy *the Prophet, saying*, In RAMA was there a Voice heard, LAMENTATION and WEEPING, and GREAT MOURNING; *Rachel* weeping for her Children, and would not be comforted, because they are not.

At what time happened this Murther of the Children at Bethlehem.

§. 12. The common Opinion is, that our Saviour was born on the 25th day of *December*; and that on the 13th day after, being the 6th of *January*, the Wise Men came to *Jerusalem*, and from thence went directly to *Bethlehem*, where, having paid their Adoration, and being warned of God, they returned homewards immediately after; and that *Herod* seeing himself mocked by the Wise Men, had thereupon perpetrated that Piece of Cruelty against the Children at *Bethlehem*; so that the whole was transacted before the Purification of the Virgin *Mary* in the first Month of the forty fourth *Julian* Year. But

(*e*) P. 159. Chr. Sacr. (*f*) C. 2. v. 16, 17, 18.

if

if the Matter be duly weighed, we shall find that this Computation is in no wise agreeable to the true Chronological Circumstances. For whether these Wise Men came out of *Arabia* or *Persia*, certain it is, that they could not perform so great a Journey in 13 Days after the Apparition of the Star, which, according to the Evangelist, was the SIGNAL of the NEW-BORN KING; considering especially the Inconveniencies of the Winter Season. It is also worth Observation, what is related by the Evangelist (*g*), That *Herod* slew all the Children that were two years old and under. *Herod* had been, questionless, informed by the Wise Men, that they had been near a whole Year upon their Journey since the time of the Apparition of the Star, which induced *Herod* to cause all the Children of two years old and under, to be slain. So that it may be more probably concluded from the Words of the (*h*) Evangelist, that Christ was at that time about one year old, than that he was of a few Days; and that the Wise Men did not come to adore Christ in his Cradle a considerable time after the Purification of his Mother, about the Beginning of the second Year of Christ, and the forty fifth *Julian* Year.

(*g*) Matth. 2. (*h*) Matth. 2. v. 16.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXXVII.

Of the Spaniſh Æra, *which is otherwiſe called the* Æra *of* CÆSAR, *and the* Æra *of* Æra's.

1. *This New* Æra *was introduced in* Spain *at that time, when after the* Death *of* C. Jul. Cæſar, *who had conquered* Spain, Cæſar Octav. M. Anton. *and* M. Æmil. Lep. *were Maſters of the* Roman *Empire.*
2. *After they had with their joint Forces overthrown* Brutus *and* Caſſius *in that bloody Battle of* Philippi.
3. *After they had divided the Provinces of the* Roman *Empire betwixt them a ſecond time: of which Diviſion ſee* (a) Dio Caſſius.
4. *This Diviſion of the World was made in the Year ſince the Building of the City* 714.
5. *When* Domit. Calv. *and* C. Aſin. Pollio *were* Roman *Conſuls, according to* Dio *and* (b) Joh. Mariana.
6. *In the* 438*th Year of this* Æra *in* September, *under the Reigns of* Arcadius *and* Honorius, Roman *Emperours, and* Flav. Stilico, *and* Flav. Aurel. Roman *Conſuls, the firſt Council, compoſed of* 19 *Biſhops, was held at* Toledo, *againſt the Hereſie of* Priſcillianus, *as is evident out of the Inſcriptions of the Decrees of this Council, cited by* Alph. Villadiego.
7. *In the* 440*th year of the* Spaniſh Æra; Arcadius *and* Honorius *were the fifth time Conſuls*

(a) L. 48. (b) L. 3. c. 24. de reb. Hiſp.

of

of Rome; *and in the same year happed an Eclipse of the Sun in* November.

8. *In the year* 447 *of the* Spanish Æra *the* Alani, Vandals *and* Suevians *entred* Spain. Idat. in Chronol.

9. *(c)* Jul. Pomerius *Bishop of* Toledo *says thus:* It is no difficult Matter to investigate the Year since the Nativity of Christ: For this *Æra* was invented 38 years before the Birth of Christ; and we now account the 624th Year of this *Æra*. *If therefore* 38 *years (this being the Interval betwixt this Æra and the Nativity of our Saviour) be subtracted from thence, the Residue is* 586 *years.*

From these and other Characters, too many to be mentioned here, it is manifest that the Spanish Æra *begun with the first of* January *in the year of the* Julian *Period* 4676, *Cycl.* ☉. 28. ☽. 2.

If therefore 4675 *years be subtracted from any certain year of the* Julian *Period, the Residue shews the year since the beginning of this Epocha; and if the said* 4675 *years be added to the known year of this* Æra, *the Product will be correspondent to the year of the* Julian *Period.*

To investigate the year since the beginning of this Epocha.

§. 1. *(d)* *Josephus Scaliger*, who follows the Footsteps of *(e)* *Dion*, affirms that the *Spaniards* would not receive this *Æra* till they received a signal Overthrow from the Proconsul *Domitius Calvinus*. But it being evident out of the same *Dion*, that this Defeat did not happen till in the second year of this *Æra*, it is much more probable to aquiesce in the Relation of *Joh. Mariana*, that the *Spaniards* followed in this *Æra* the Footsteps of the *Antiochians* and *Ægyptians*

How this Æra was introduced in Spain.

(c) L. 3. contr. Jud. (d) L. 5. p. 445. de Em. Temp. (e) L. 48. Hist. Rom.

ptians, who, about 11 years after the Death of *Cleopatra*, began to compute their years from the Reign of *Auguſtus*, to ſhew their ready Submiſſion and Obedience to their new Prince.

This Æra was introduced at the time of the 2d Diviſion of the Empire.

§. 2. The Provinces of the *Roman* Empire were at two ſeveral times divided betwixt the *Triumviri*. In the firſt Diviſion *Octavius* had for his ſhare *Italy*, *Africa*, *Sicily* and *Sardinia*; *Lepidus*, *Spain* and *Gallia Narbonenſis*; *Anthony*, the whole *Gallia* on both ſides of the *Alps*; which Diviſion was made, according to (*f*) *Dion*, in the year ſince the Building of the City 711. Some begin this *Æra* with this firſt Diviſion, which hapned in the 4th year after the Death of *Cæſar*; but according to the Chronological Circumſtances, the ſame may be with more Certainty referr'd to the ſecond Diviſion, which was made in the 6th year after *Cæſar*'s Death.

The Uſefulneſs of this Æra.

§. 3. This *Æra* is generally made uſe of in the Acts and Decrees of the Synods, and other *Spaniſh* Inſcriptions, the moſt famous Synods of *Spain* and *Africa* being diſtinguiſhed and deſcribed according to the Computation of the *Spaniſh Æra*.

When the Uſe of this Æra ceaſed.

§. 4. (*g*) *Joh. Mariana* obſerves that the Uſe of this *Æra* ceaſed in the year of Chriſt 1383, under *John* I. King of *Caſtile*, in whoſe ſtead was introduced the *Æra* of Chriſt, following in this Point the Example of thoſe of *Valentia* and *Portugal*.

(*f*) L. 46. (*g*) L. 3. c. 24. de reb. Hiſp.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXXVIII.

Of the Epocha of the Battle of Actium *used among the* Ægyptians.

1. Octavius *took up Arms against* Anthony, *who having receded from the Rules agreed upon betwixt the* Triumviri, *and being entangled in the Snares of* Cleopatra, *had given unto her (to the no small Detriment of the whole* Roman *Empire) the Provinces of* Phœnicia, Syria, Cyprus, *a great part of* Sicily, *of* Judæa, *and that part of* Arabia Nabatæa *that extends its self towards the Ocean.*

2. *After the* Death *of* Sext. Pompeius, *the King of* Armenia *was taken Prisoner; and the other Nations which were engaged in War against* Cæsar, *were forced to submit, and the* Parthians *restored to a peaceable Condition.*

3. *The chiefest Motive which induced* Cæsar *to arm against* Anthony, *was, that he had understood that* Anthony *had called* Cæsario *in his last Will the Son of* Julius Cæsar, *and had ranged him amongst the Family of the* Cæsars.

4. *This Civil War betwixt* Cæsar *and* Anthony *begun after the* Philippean, Perusian *and* Sicilian *Wars, when* Cn. Domitius *and* C. Soffius *were* Roman *Consuls, both of the* Anthonian *Faction.*

5. *In the same year that the Battle of* Actium *was fought,* Cæsar *was the third time, and* Val. Messala Roman *Consuls. See* (a) Dio Cassius,

(a) L. 50. Hist. Rom.

(b)

(*b*) Plutarch, (*c*) Suetonius, Florus, Eutropius, Oroſius, *and others.*

6. *The Battle of* Actium *was fought in the* 7th *year of the Reign of* Herod, *at which time he was raiſing Forces for the Service of* Anthony, *who having refuſed to accept of them, ordered him to employ them againſt the* Arabians. *See* (*d*) Joſephus.

7. *The Battle of* Actium *was fought on the ſecond day of* September, *according to* Dio, ſub initio Lib. 1.

8. *In the next following year* Octav. *undertook the ſecond Expedition againſt* Anthony *and* Cleopatra, *who then laid violent Hands upon themſelves. This hapned when* Octavius *was the* 4th *time, and* M. Craſſus *Conſuls of* Rome. *According to* (*e*) Dio *and* Aurel. Caſſiodorus.

9. Cleopatra *laid violent Hands upon her ſelf in the* 22*d year of her Reign, according to* (*f*) Euſeb. (*g*) Jornand. *and eſpecially* (*h*) Plutarch, *who ſays, ſhe was thirty nine years old when ſhe died.*

10. Cæſar *reigned in Conjunction with* Anthony 12 *years, and afterwards* 44 *years. See* Suetonius (*i*).

11. *According to* (*k*) Euſeb. Cleopatra *laid violent Hands upon her ſelf in the* 3*d year of the* 187*th Olympiad.*

12. *The* Actian *or rather* Alexandrian *Epocha of the* Ægyptians *ought to be coincident with the* THOT *of* Nabonaſſar 769, *which is called the* Actian THOT. *See* Ptolemy.

13. *The* 42*d year of* Auguſtus *was the* 28*th year ſince the Conqueſt of* Ægypt *and the Death of* Anthony *and* Cleopatra, *the laſt of the Royal*

(*b*) Vit. Antonii. (*c*) In Octav. Auguſt. (*d*) Lib. 15. c. 6, 7. Ant. (*e*) Loc. Cit. (*f*) In Chron. (*g*) Regn. Succeſſ. (*h*) Vit. Antonii. (*i*) Loc. Cit. (*k*) In Chron.

Race

Race of the Lagidæ *in* Ægypt *(after they had reigned* 295 *years) in the ſame year happened the Nativity of our Saviour. See* Euſeb. (*l*).

14. *The* 1014*th year ſince the Beginning of the firſt Olympiad, and ſince the Building of* Rome 991. *The* 283*d* Julian *Year was the* 267*th year ſince the Conqueſt of* Alexandria. *See* (*m*) Cenſorinus.

15. Ægypt *was conquered by* Oct. Cæſar, *in the Month of* Auguſt. *See* (*n*) Macrob.

16. *Likewiſe* Octavius *made himſelf Maſter of* Alexandria, *on the firſt day of* Auguſt. *See* Oroſius (*o*).

17. *On the ſame day that* Cæſar *took* Alexandria, *the* Rhæti *were* 15 *years after defeated by* Druſus *his General. See* (*p*) Porphyrion, *which has been likewiſe expreſſed by* Horace *in the following Verſes:*

——— Nam tibi quo die
Portus Alexandræa ſupplex,
Et vacuam patefecit aulam,
Fortuna luſtro proſpera tertio
Belli ſecundos reddidit exitus:
Laudemque, & optatum, peractis
Imperiis, decus arrogavit.

From theſe Characters it is certain that the Battle near the Promontory of Actium *was fought in the year of the* Julian *Period* 4683, *Cycl.* ☉. 7. ☽. 9. *on the* 2*d day of* September; *and that* Alexandria, *after the Defection of* Anthony's *Fleet to* Cæſar, *was taken in the next following year, and that of the* Julian *Period*, 4684, *Cycl.* ☉. 8. ☽. 10. *on the firſt day of* Auguſt, *and that in the ſame Month* Cleopatra *fol-*

(*l*) Chr. L. 1. c. 5. Hiſt. Eccleſ. (*m*) C. 21. de D. N. (*n*) L. 1. c. 12. Sat. (*o*) L. 6. c. 19. (*p*) L. 2. Rer. Auguſt.

lowing the Example of Anthony, *laid violent Hands upon her self.*

To inveſtigate the Year ſince the Beginning of this Æra.

If therefore from any certain year of the Julian *Period given, be ſubtracted* 4682 *years and* 8 *Months, the Reſidue ſhews the year ſince the Battle fought near* Actium. *And if* 4683 *Years and* 7 *Months be ſubtracted in like manner, the Reſidue is correſpondent to the year ſince the Conqueſt of* Alexandria *and* Ægypt *by* Octavius Auguſtus.

Various Computations of the Actian Æra.

§. 1. THIS Epocha, which is called the *Actian*, is taken in a three-fold Sence among the Ancient Hiſtorians. For ſome deduce its Origin from the Battle of *Actium*, according to (*q*) *Dio. Clemens Alexandrinus*, and ſome other *Ægyptian* Writers, begin it in the next following Year from the Conqueſt of the City of *Alexandria*: Since which time others have begun their Computations from the time that the *Ægyptians* received the *Julian* Year inſtead of the *Nabonaſſarean*, which was done in the Seven hundred and twenty fourth *Nabonaſſarean* Year, on the Twenty ninth of *Auguſt*.

(*q*) L. 51. Hiſt. Rom.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXXIX.

Of the Epocha of the Auguſtus's.

1. *Both the Years and Name of the* Auguſtus's *owes it Origin to that time when* Octav. Cæſar *was entitled with the Name of* AUGUSTUS *by the* Roman *Senate, which Title has ſince been tranſmitted to all his Succeſſours.*
2. Octavius *was not ſirnamed* AUGUSTUS *till after he had entred the City thrice in Triumph, had put a Period to the Civil War, reſtored Tranquillity to the whole* Roman *Empire, had heaped great and many Benefits upon the City and People of* Rome, *had fill'd up the Senate with his Friends, and had the legal Adminiſtration of the Government conferr'd upon him by the Senate and People of* Rome.
3. *At which time* Octavius *was the 7th time, and* M. Vipſan. Agrippa *the 3d time Conſuls of* Rome. *See* (*a*) Dio, (*b*) Cenſorinus, *and* Aur. Caſſiodorus.
4. *When* Ægypt *was reduced under the* Roman *Juriſdiction two years before.* (*c*) Cenſorinus.
5. *The Years of the* AUGUSTUS'S *begin with the firſt of* January, *though* Cæſar *was entitled with the Name of* AUGUSTUS *by* L. Munatius Plancus, *and the reſt of the* Roman *Citizens, on the* 14*th of* January. *See* Cenſorinus, *with whom very nearly agrees* Ovid, *when he ſays thus:*

(*a*) L. 2. Hiſt. Rom. (*b*) C. 21. (*c*) Loc. Cit.

Idibus in magnis caſtus Jovis æde Sacerdos
Semimaris flammis viſcera libat ovis.
Redditaque eſt omnis populo provincia noſtro:
Et tuus AUGUSTO nomine dictus avus.

From theſe Characters we conclude that the Epocha of the Auguſtus's, *and the legal Adminiſtration of the Government by the* Cæſars, *began with the Month of* January, *in the year of the* Julian *Period* 4687, *Cycl.* ☉. 11. ☽. 13.

To inveſtigate the year ſince the beginning of this Epocha. *If therefore* 4686 *years be ſubtracted from any certain year of the* Julian *Period, the Reſidue ſhews the deſired Year ſince the Beginning of the Epocha of the* AUGUSTUS'S.

How manifold is the Beginning of this Epocha. §. 1. THere is no leſs than 6 ſeveral Beginnings of this Epocha: For ſome begin it with the Death of *Julius Cæſar*; others with the firſt year when *Octavius* was Conſul of *Rome*, which was in the third *Julian* Year: Some from the time of the Triumviral Diviſion, being the 6th *Julian* Year; others from the time of the Battle of *Actium*, being the 15th *Julian* Year; others from the Conqueſt of *Alexandria* and *Ægypt*; others at laſt from the time *Octavius* received the Title of AUGUSTUS.

The Romans *and* Ægyptians *differ in this Epocha.* §. 2. It has been ſaid before how that the *Romans* begin the years of *Auguſtus* from that time when *Octavius* received that Title. But the *Ægyptians* being conquered two years before that time, the third year of the *Auguſtus's* among the *Ægyptians* is the firſt with the *Romans*.

Why Octavius *was ſirnamed* Auguſtus. §. 3. *Suetonius* gives us the Reaſon why *Octavius* was ſirnamed *Auguſtus* in the following Words: *Oct. Auguſti Cognomen aſſumpſit, Munatii Planci ſententia: cum quibuſdam cenſentibus, Romulum appellari oportere, quaſi & ipſum conditorem urbis, prævaluiſſet, ut Auguſtus potius vocaretur, non tantum novo,*

novo, sed etiam ampliore cognomine: quod loca quoque religiosa, & in quibus augurato quid consecratur, augusta dicantur, ab auctu, vel ab avium gestu, gustuve: As *Ennius* likewise relates in the following Words:

Augusto augurio, postquam inclyta condita Roma est.

And in the same Sence says *Ovid*, L. 1. *Fastor.*

Sed tamen humanis celebrantur honoribus omnes:
Hic socium magno, cum Jove nomen habet.
Sancta vocant Augusta patres, augusta vocantur
Templa Sacerdotum rite sacrata manu.

From hence also the *Greeks* call it *Venerable* and *Sacred*, according to (d) *Dio*; but the *Germans* have committed an Error in the Etymology of this Word, when they have interpreted *Augustus* an Increaser of the Empire.

§. 4. I am of Opinion, that it will be of no small Use to reduce the principal Heads of the History of *Augustus* to the *Julian* Period and the *Julian* Years. *The principal Heads of the History of Augustus.*

In the Year of the *Jul.* Period 4651, 23d of *September*, *Octavius* was born.

In the Year of the *Jul.* Period 4670, in the 2d *Jul.* Year, in the 19th Year of the Age of *Octavius*, on the 15th of *March*, *Julius Cæsar* was slain; and *Octavius* being sent by *Julius*, who was preparing for an Expedition against the *Daci* and *Parthians* towards *Apollonia*, returned to *Rome* as soon as he understood that *Cæsar* had made him his Heir.

(d) Lib. 3.

In the Year of the *Jul.* Period 4671, in the 3d *Jul.* Year, *Anthony* was vanquish'd in a bloody Battle near *Mutina*.

In the ſame Year, on the 19 day of *Auguſt*, *Octavius* then but 21 years of Age, was made Conſul, and on the 27th day of *November*, *Octavius*, *Anthony* and *Lepidus* divided the *Roman* Empire betwixt themſelves.

In the Year of the *Jul.* Period 4672, in the 4th *Jul.* Year, *Octavius* and *Anthony* fought againſt *Brutus* and *Caſſius*, and vanquiſh'd them near *Philippis*.

In the Year of the *Jul.* Period 4676, in the 8th *Jul.* Year, was made the ſecond Diviſion of the Empire, which gave Birth to the *Spaniſh* Epocha.

In the Year of the *Jul.* Period, and the 10th *Jul.* Year, *Sextus Pompeius* was vanquiſhed by *Cæſar*, being ſtrengthened by the Forces of *Lepidus*.

In the Year of the *Jul.* Period 4681, in the 13th *Jul.* Year, the Jealouſie that had been for ſome time betwixt *Anthony* and *Cæſar* broke out into open Enmity.

In the Year of the *Jul.* Period 4683, in the 15th *Jul.* Year, *Anthony* was overthrown by *Cæſar* near *Actium*.

In the Year of the *Jul.* Period 4684, in the 16th *Jul.* Year, *Cæſar* conquered *Alexandria* and *Ægypt*, and *Anthony* and *Cleopatra* killed themſelves.

In the Year of the *Jul.* Period 4687, in the 19th *Jul.* Year, *Octavius Cæſar* was ſirnamed AUGUSTUS. Of which ſee *Vellejus Paterculus*, *Lib.* 2.

In the Year of the *Jul.* Period 4711, in the 43d *Jul.* Year, in the 42d of the Reign of *Auguſtus*, our Saviour was born.

In

In the Year of the *Jul.* Period 4727, in the 59th *Jul.* Year, on the 19th day of *August*, died the Emperour *Octavius Augustus* in the 76th Year of his Age, and was succeeded by *Tiberius*.

CHAP. XL.

Of the True and Vulgar Epocha of CHRIST.

To regulate the Epocha of the Nativity of Christ, both according to the Tenure of the Sacred and Profane History, these following Characters must be observed.

1. *Our Saviour was born in the Days of* Herod *the King, who was succeeded by* Archelaus (*a*).
2. *When* Octavius Augustus *was Emperour of* Rome (*b*).
3. *By whom was sent out a Decree that all the World should be taxed* (*c*).
4. *And this Decree was made first when* Cyrenius *was Governour of* Syria (*d*)
5. *In the 15th year of* Tiberius Cæsar, Pontius Pilate *being Governour of* Judæa, *and* Herod *being Tetrarch of* Galilee, *and his Brother* Philip *Tetrarch of* Iturea, *and of the Region of* Trachonitis, *and* Lysias *the Tetrarch of* Abylene; Annas *and* Caiaphas *being the High-Priests*, &c. JESUS *himself began to be about thirty years of Age, being (as was suppo-*

(*a*) Mat. 2. v. 1. 22. (*b*) Luk. 2. v. 1. (*c*) Ibid. (*d*) Luk. 2. ver. 2.

ſed) the Son of Joſeph, *which was the Son of* Heli (*e*),

6. *In the 6th Month after* Elizabeth *had conceived* John *by* Zecharias *the Prieſt of the Courſe of* Abia, *after the Days of his Miniſtration were accompliſhed, the Angel* Gabriel *was ſent to announce to the Virgin* Mary *the Conception of Chriſt* (*f*).

7. *Thus ſays* Clem. Alexandrinus: Our Saviour was born in the ſame 28th year when the fixed Decree was made by *Auguſtus* about a Taxation: *Which, doubtleſs was ſaid in Reference of what is related by* (*g*) Dio Caſſius; That the Day when *Alexandria* was taken by *Auguſtus*, was ordered to be kept as an Anniverſary Feaſt, from whence was to be begun the Computation of the following Years.

8. It was therefore in the 42d year of the Reign of *Auguſtus*, and in the 28th after the Conqueſt of *Ægypt*, and the Death of *Anthony* and *Cleopatra*, that our Saviour JESUS CHRIST was born; at the time of the firſt Taxation by *Cyrenius* then Governour of *Syria*, in the City of *Bethlehem* of *Judæa*, purſuant to the Prophecies of the Prophets: *Theſe are the Words of* (*h*) Euſeb. *with whom agree, as to the Year of* Auguſtus, (*i*) Clem. Alexandrinus, Epiphan (*k*) Tertullian, (*l*) Paul. Oroſius, (*m*) St. Hierome, Iſodorus, Jornandes, Zonaras, *&c.*

9. *The Death of the Emperour* Commodus *happed* 194 *years after the Nativity of Chriſt. But the Emperour* Commodus *was murthered* (*according to* Clem. Alexandrinus (*n*)) *in the year of the* Ægyptian Æra 222. *His Death is deſcrib'd by* Dio Caſſius (*o*).

(*e*) Luk. 3. v. 1, 2, 23. (*f*) Luk. 1. v. 23, 26, 36. (*g*) Lib. 1. (*h*) L. 1. c. 5. Hiſt. Eccleſ. (*i*) L. 1. Hær. (*k*) Contr. Jud. c. 8. (*l*) L. 1. c. 1. L. 7. c. 2. (*m*) Chr. Euſeb. (*n*) L. 1. Str. (*o*) L. 72. H. R.

10.

10. *At the time of the Nativity of our Saviour* Lentulus *and* Messala *were* Roman *Consuls; though there are also some who refer his Nativity to the Consulship of* Augustus *the 13th time, and of* Plautus Sylv. *See* Aurel. Cassiodorus, Geo. Cedrenus, (*p*) Epiphan. Lucius Dexter, Mar. Scotus, *&c.*

11 *Christ was born in the Year of the* Constantinopolitan Epocha 6506, *Cycl.* ☉. Græc. 18. ☽. 15. *See* Geor. Cedren.

12. *Christ was born on the* 23*d day of* December, *according to the vulgar Opinion; which Opinion was already generally received at the time of* Theophilus *Bishop of* Cæsarea *in* Palæstine, *who lived under the Reign of* Commodus *and* Severus: *And* Vict. Pictav *affirms, that in the* 3*d Age after the Nativity of Christ, the same was celebrated among the Christians about the Hybernal* Solstice, *which Custom was afterwards retained by those present at the General Councils of* Basel *and* Florence; *as also the ancient* Roman *Catholick Writers of the Martyrologies, Breviaries, Diaries, &c.*

From these Characters it seems evident to me, that our Saviour was born in the Year of the Julian *Period* 4711, *Cycl.* ☉. 7. ☽. 18. *on the* 25*th day of* December.

How to investigate the Year of this Epocha.

If therefore 4711 *years be subtracted from any certain Year given of the* Julian *Period, the Residue shews the Year since the Beginning of this Epocha, &c.*

But there being a Difference of two whole years betwixt the vulgar Computation and this; If therefore 4713 *years be subtracted from any known Year of the* Julian *Period, the Residue will be correspondent to the Year since the Beginning of this Epocha: Or if the said* 4713 *years be added*

(*p*) Lib. 1. Haref.

to

to the known year of this vulgar Epocha, *the Product will shew the Year of the* Julian *Period.*

And if, according to the Opinion of some, the Computation be begun in the Year preceding the vulgar Epocha, *let the same be subtracted from the 4714th Year of the* Julian *Period; and the Residue will shew the Year of the* Julian *Period, correspondent to the Year next preceding the Nativity of* Christ. *And if the true Year of the* Julian *Period be known, and you would investigate the Year before the Beginning of the vulgar* Epocha, *subtract 4714 years from the known Year of the* Julian *Period, and the Residue will shew the Year next preceding the vulgar* Epocha.

Whether it be impossible to find out the true year of the Nativity of Christ.

§. 1. (q) FRed. Spanheim. (r) *Joh. Cloppenburgius, Joh. Vossius*, and many others, are of Opinion that it is impossible to determine the true Year of the Nativity of Christ. They alledge that the uncertain Beginnings of the several different *Epocha's*, and their unequal Conceptions, and uncertain Foundations, together with the various Interpretations of so many Authors of Note, are insuperable Difficulties. They add to this the Institution of the *Christian Epocha*, not till a considerable time after the Nativity of *Christ*, the different Opinions and Computations concerning the Reign of *Herods*, the Taxation of *Cyrenius*, and the thirty Years of *Christ*; from whence they conclude that all the Opinions of the Chronologers concerning this *Epocha*, are founded upon false and uncertain Conjectures. But we being, in the Constitution of this *Epocha* guided by the Sacred Writ, the Authority of very ancient Chronologers, and the unquestiona-

(q) Dubior. Ev. Part 2. dub. 1. (r) Syn. disp. select. Exc. 8.

ble

ble Truth of the Celestial Characters this *Epocha* may be look'd upon as entangled in some Difficulties; but ought not to be numbered amongst the Impossibilities.

§. 2. The Interpreters are much divided in their Opinions concerning the Taxation under *Cyrenius*, the main Difficulty arising from thence, that at the time of the Nativity of *Christ*, *Sentius Saturninus*, and not *Cyrenius*, was Governour of *Syria*: For (*s*) *Josephus* enumerates the Governours of *Syria*, in the following Order: *Sentius Saturninus*, *Quintilius Varus*, *Quirinius*: Besides that, he makes not the least Mention of the first Decree of *Augustus* at the time of the Nativity of *Christ*, but only of the Taxation under *Cyrenius* after the Banishment of *Archelaus* and the Death of *Herod*. To resolve this Difficulty, the Interpreters have had Recourse to divers Explications. *Theodorus Beza* pretends to correct the Text of St. *Luke*, and to substitute the Word Κυιντιλιε for the Word Κυρηνιε. But, besides that it is of very ill consequence to correct the Sacred Text, neither *Porphyrius*, nor *Julian the Apostate*, tho' they were not unacquainted with what is said in the New Testament concerning the Taxation of *Cyrenius* under the Reign of *Herod*, never attempted to contradict it; and (*t*) *Justin Martyr* alledges in his Behalf the Taxation-Books made by *Cyrenius*. *Calvin* and *Salmero* accuse *Josephus* of a Mistake in the time of the Taxation of *Cyrenius*: But, to lay so gross an Error at the Door of so great an Historian, is, in Effect, to call in question the Veracity of his whole History. Neither am I of the same Opinion with *Eusebius* (*u*), who maintains the Taxation mentioned by (*x*) *Josephus*, to have been the same

Concerning the Taxation under Cyrenius.

(*s*) L. 17. c. ult. Ant. & L. 18. c. 1. (*t*) Apol. 2. pro Christ. (*u*) L. 1. c. 5. Hist. Eccl. (*x*) L. 17. c. 15. L. 18. c. 1.

with

with the Taxation, of which mention is made by St. *Luke*, *Spanhemius* having sufficiently shewn the great Difference there is betwixt them. (y) *Joh. Georg. Herwart* and (z) *Kepler* interpret the Words of St. *Luke* (a), thus; that the Genitive Case ἡγεμονεύοντος joined with the Word πρώτη, ought to be taken in the Comparative Mood, and signifies as much as if it had been said, that this Taxation was the first and was made before *Quirinius* or *Cyrenius* was Governour or *Prefect* of *Syria*. But if this had been the Sence of St. *Luke*, he would, questionless, have express'd it thus: πρότερον τοῦ ἡγεμονεύειν, this being more agreeable to the Style of this Evangelist. In my Opinion it is the safest way to conclude, that either *Cyrenius* has been twice Governour of *Syria*, or that he was sent at the time of the Nativity of our Saviour on purpose into *Syria* with full Power to regulate this Taxation; the Word ἡγεμονεύειν implying any superiour Power; and that *Josephus* did not make mention of it, because it came perhaps never to his Knowledge.

How to reconcile the Synchronism of the 15th year of Tiberius *and the 30th of Christ.*

§. 3. This Character of the Nativity of *Christ*, which ought to be considered as one of the fundamental ones of this Epocha, has met with dubious Interpretations: For some of them explain the Words of (a) St. *Luke* thus; *Jesus began to be thirty years of Age*, &c. Whereas others would have it, *Jesus was about thirty years of Age*, to wit, *when he began his Ministry*. Of the first Opinion is *Scaliger*, who (b) pretends to evince that *Christ* was then entring his 31st year of Age. But I am rather inclin'd to believe that the Word ἀρχόμενος is made use of here in an Eliptick Sense; and that it ought to be understood as relating to διακονίας or διδάσκειν, or the Ministry of *Christ*.

(y) Chron. c. 241. (z) Ecl. Chr. (a) C. 2. v. 2. (b) C. 3. v. 23. L. 3. Isag. Chron.

§. 4.

§. 4. This vulgar *Epocha* of the Nativity of *Christ* was not only made uſe of by the Chriſtian Writers at the time of *Beda*, but the ſame has alſo met with a Patron among the Modern Authors in the Perſon of *Henr. Harvil.* a *Franciſcan* Fryar, but to no great Purpoſe, it being certain that the ſame is repugnant to the true Computation of the time of *Herod*, and the Synchroniſm of the 15th year of the Reign of *Tiberius*, and the 30th year of the Age of our Saviour, and ſeveral other Eccleſiaſtical Characters before-mentioned. *Whether the Vulgar Epocha of Chriſt be the true one.*

§. 5. There is not the leaſt Queſtion but that *Dionyſius*, ſirnamed *Exiguus*, a Native of *Scythia*, and a *Roman* Abbot, was the firſt Author of the Vulgar *Æra* of the Nativity of *Chriſt* about the Year 527; the Ancients accounting their Years before that time, either from the Building of the City of *Rome*, from the *Conſuls*, or the Emperour *Diocleſian*, or from the firſt Indiction. See *W. Langius* (*d*). *Whether Dionyſius Exiguus was the firſt Author of this Epocha.*

§. 6. In the *Roman Martyrology*, publiſhed by the Authority of Pope *Gregory* XIII, and reviſed by the Command of Pope *Urban* VIII, we find theſe following Words, which are every year on the 25th day of *December* read in publick: *In the Year ſince the Creation of the World, when God created Heaven and Earth* 5199: *And ſince the Deluge, in the* 2957*th*; *and the Birth of* Abraham *in the* 2015*th year*: *From* Moſes, *and the time of the* Iſraelites *leaving of* Ægypt, *in the* 1510*th*: *And from the time of* David's *being anointed* King, *in the* 1032*d Year*; *In the* 42*d annual Week of* Daniel; *In the* 194*th Olympiad*: *In the* 752*d Year ſince the Building of* Rome; *in the* 42*d Year of the Reign of the Emperor* Oct. Auguſtus, *when the whole World was bleſſed with Peace. In* *Concerning the Synchroniſms mentioned in the* Roman Martyrology.

(*d*) L. 1. c. 1. de An. Chriſti.

the

OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Breviarium Chronologicum.

BEING A

TREATISE

Describing the

Terms and Most Celebrated Characters, Periods and Epocha's us'd in

CHRONOLOGY.

By which that Useful SCIENCE may easily be attained to.

Writ in *Latin* by *Gyles Strauchius*, *D.D.* and Publick Professor in the University of *Wittebergh*.

And now done into *English* from the Third Edition, with Additions.

Time *of it self is nothing, but from Thought*
Receives its Rise, by lab'ring Fancy wrought,
From things consider'd whilst we think on some
As present, some as past, or yet to come.
Creech's Lucretius.

LONDON,

Printed for *A. Bosvile* at the *Dial* against St. *Dunstan's* Church, and *P. Gilburne* at the *Harrow* the Corner of *Chancery-Lane*, both in *Fleetstreet*, 1699

In the Year of the *Jul.* Period 4671, in the 3d *Jul.* Year, *Anthony* was vanquish'd in a bloody Battle near *Mutina*.

In the ſame Year, on the 19 day of *Auguſt*, *Octavius* then but 21 years of Age, was made Conſul, and on the 27th day of *November*, *Octavius*, *Anthony* and *Lepidus* divided the *Roman* Empire betwixt themſelves.

In the Year of the *Jul.* Period 4672, in the 4th *Jul.* Year, *Octavius* and *Anthony* fought againſt *Brutus* and *Caſſius*, and vanquiſh'd them near *Philippis*.

In the Year of the *Jul.* Period 4676, in the 8th *Jul.* Year, was made the ſecond Diviſion of the Empire, which gave Birth to the *Spaniſh* Epocha.

In the Year of the *Jul.* Period, and the 10th *Jul.* Year, *Sextus Pompeius* was vanquiſhed by *Cæſar*, being ſtrengthened by the Forces of *Lepidus*.

In the Year of the *Jul.* Period 4681, in the 13th *Jul.* Year, the Jealouſie that had been for ſome time betwixt *Anthony* and *Cæſar* broke out into open Enmity.

In the Year of the *Jul.* Period 4683, in the 15th *Jul.* Year, *Anthony* was overthrown by *Cæſar* near *Actium*.

In the Year of the *Jul.* Period 4684, in the 16th *Jul.* Year, *Cæſar* conquered *Alexandria* and *Ægypt*, and *Anthony* and *Cleopatra* killed themſelves.

In the Year of the *Jul.* Period 4687, in the 19th *Jul.* Year, *Octavius Cæſar* was ſirnamed AUGUSTUS. Of which ſee *Vellejus Paterculus*, *Lib.* 2.

In the Year of the *Jul.* Period 4711, in the 43d *Jul.* Year, in the 42d of the Reign of *Auguſtus*, our Saviour was born.

In

In the Year of the *Jul.* Period 4727, in the 59th *Jul.* Year, on the 19th day of *Augusti*, died the Emperour *Octavius Augustus* in the 76th Year of his Age, and was succeeded by *Tiberius*.

CHAP. XL.

Of the True and Vulgar Epocha of CHRIST.

To regulate the Epocha of the Nativity of Christ, both according to the Tenure of the Sacred and Profane History, these following Characters must be observed.

1. *Our Saviour was born in the* Days *of* Herod *the King, who was succeeded by* Archelaus (*a*).
2. *When* Octavius Augustus *was Emperour of* Rome (*b*).
3. *By whom was sent out a Decree that all the World should be taxed* (*c*).
4. *And this Decree was made first when* Cyrenius *was Governour of* Syria (*d*)
5. *In the 15th year of* Tiberius Cæsar, Pontius Pilate *being Governour of* Judæa, *and* Herod, *being Tetrarch of* Galilee, *and his Brother* Philip *Tetrarch of* Iturea, *and of the Region of* Trachonitis, *and* Lysias *the Tetrarch of* Abylene; Annas *and* Caiaphas *being the High-Priests*, &c. JESUS *himself began to be about thirty years of Age, being* (*as was suppo-*

(*a*) Mat. 2. v. 1. 22. (*b*) Luk. 2. v. 1. (*c*) Ibid. (*d*) Luk. 2. ver. 2.

ſed) the Son of Joſeph, *which was the Son of* Heli (*e*),

6. *In the 6th Month after* Elizabeth *had conceived* John *by* Zecharias *the Prieſt of the Courſe of* Abia, *after the Days of his Miniſtration were accompliſhed, the Angel* Gabriel *was ſent to announce to the Virgin* Mary *the Conception of Chriſt* (*f*).

7. *Thus ſays* Clem. Alexandrinus : Our Saviour was born in the ſame 28th year when the fixed Decree was made by *Auguſtus* about a Taxation : *Which, doubtleſs was ſaid in Reference of what is related by* (*g*) Dio Caſſius ; That the Day when *Alexandria* was taken by *Auguſtus*, was ordered to be kept as an Anniverſary Feaſt, from whence was to be begun the Computation of the following Years.

8. It was therefore in the 42d year of the Reign of *Auguſtus*, and in the 28th after the Conqueſt of *Ægypt*, and the Death of *Anthony* and *Cleopatra*, that our Saviour JESUS CHRIST was born ; at the time of the firſt Taxation by *Cyrenius* then Governour of *Syria*, in the City of *Bethlehem* of *Judæa*, purſuant to the Prophecies of the Prophets : *Theſe are the Words of* (*h*) Euſeb. *with whom agree, as to the Year of* Auguſtus, (*i*) Clem. Alexandrinus, Epiphan (*k*) Tertullian, (*l*) Paul. Oroſius, (*m*) St. Hierome, Iſodorus, Jornandes, Zonaras, *&c.*

9. *The Death of the Emperour* Commodus *happed* 194 *years after the Nativity of Chriſt. But the Emperour* Commodus *was murthered* (*according to* Clem. Alexandrinus (*n*)) *in the year of the* Ægyptian Æra 222. *His Death is deſcrib'd by* Dio Caſſius (*o*).

(*e*) Luk. 3. v. 1, 2, 23. (*f*) Luk. 1. v. 23, 26, 36. (*g*) Lib. 1. (*h*) L. 1. c. 5. Hiſt. Eccleſ. (*i*) L. 1. Hær. (*k*) Contr. Jud. c. 8. (*l*) L. 1. c. 1. L. 7. c. 2. (*m*) Chr. Euſeb. (*n*) L. 1. Str. (*o*) L. 72. H. R.

10.

10. *At the time of the Nativity of our Saviour* Lentulus *and* Messala *were* Roman *Consuls; though there are also some who refer his Nativity to the Consulship of* Augustus *the 13th time, and of* Plautus Sylv. *See* Aurel. Cassiodorus, Geo. Cedrenus, (*p*) Epiphan. Lucius Dexter, Mar. Scotus, *&c.*

11. *Christ was born in the Year of the* Constantinopolitan Epocha 6506, *Cycl.* ☉. Græc. 18. ☽. 15. *See* Geor. Cedren.

12. *Christ was born on the* 23*d day of* December, *according to the vulgar Opinion; which Opinion was already generally received at the time of* Theophilus *Bishop of* Cæsarea *in* Palæstine, *who lived under the Reign of* Commodus *and* Severus: *And* Vict. Pictav *affirms, that in the* 3*d Age after the Nativity of Christ, the same was celebrated among the Christians about the Hybernal* Solstice, *which Custom was afterwards retained by those present at the General Councils of* Basel *and* Florence; *as also the ancient* Roman *Catholick Writers of the Martyrologies, Breviaries, Diaries,* &c.

From these Characters it seems evident to me, that our Saviour was born in the Year of the Julian *Period* 4711, *Cycl.* ☉. 7. ☽. 18. *on the* 25*th day of* December.

If therefore 4711 *years be subtracted from any certain Year given of the* Julian *Period, the Residue shews the Year since the Beginning of this Epocha,* &c. *How to investigate the Year of this Epocha.*

But there being a Difference of two whole years betwixt the vulgar Computation and this; If therefore 4713 *years be subtracted from any known Year of the* Julian *Period, the Residue will be correspondent to the Year since the Beginning of this Epocha: Or if the said* 4713 *years be added*

(*p*) Lib. 1. Hæres.

to

to the known year of this vulgar Epocha, *the Product will ſhew the Year of the* Julian *Period.*

And if, according to the Opinion of ſome, the Computation be begun in the Year preceding the vulgar Epocha, *let the ſame be ſubtracted from the 4714th Year of the* Julian *Period; and the Reſidue will ſhew the Year of the* Julian *Period, correſpondent to the Year next preceding the Nativity of* Chriſt. *And if the true Year of the* Julian *Period be known, and you would inveſtigate the Year before the Beginning of the vulgar* Epocha, *ſubtract 4714 years from the known Year of the* Julian *Period, and the Reſidue will ſhew the Year next preceding the vulgar* Epocha.

Whether it be impoſſible to find out the true year of the Nativity of Chriſt.

§. 1. (q) Fred. Spanheim. (r) *Joh. Cloppenburgius, Joh. Voſſius*, and many others, are of Opinion that it is impoſſible to determine the true Year of the Nativity of Chriſt. They alledge that the uncertain Beginnings of the ſeveral different *Epocha's*, and their unequal Conceptions, and uncertain Foundations, together with the various Interpretations of ſo many Authors of Note, are inſuperable Difficulties. They add to this the Inſtitution of the *Chriſtian Epocha*, not till a conſiderable time after the Nativity of *Chriſt*, the different Opinions and Computations concerning the Reign of *Herods*, the Taxation of *Cyrenius*, and the thirty Years of *Chriſt*; from whence they conclude that all the Opinions of the Chronologers concerning this *Epocha*, are founded upon falſe and uncertain Conjectures. But we being, in the Conſtitution of this *Epocha* guided by the Sacred Writ, the Authority of very ancient Chronologers, and the unqueſtiona-

(q) Dubior. Ev. Part 2. dub. 1. (r) Syn. diſp. ſelect. Exc. 8.

ble

ble Truth of the Celestial Characters this *Epocha* may be look'd upon as entangled in some Difficulties; but ought not to be numbered amongst the Impossibilities.

§. 2. The Interpreters are much divided in their Opinions concerning the Taxation under *Cyrenius*, the main Difficulty arising from thence, that at the time of the Nativity of *Christ*, *Sentius Saturninus*, and not *Cyrenius*, was Governour of *Syria*: For (s) *Josephus* enumerates the Governours of *Syria*, in the following Order: *Sentius Saturninus*, *Quintilius Varus*, *Quirinius*: Besides that, he makes not the least Mention of the first Decree of *Augustus* at the time of the Nativity of *Christ*, but only of the Taxation under *Cyrenius* after the Banishment of *Archelaus* and the Death of *Herod*. To resolve this Difficulty, the Interpreters have had Recourse to divers Explications. *Theodorus Beza* pretends to correct the Text of St. *Luke*, and to substitute the Word Κυιντηλιȣ for the Word Κυηνίȣ. But, besides that it is of very ill consequence to correct the Sacred Text, neither *Porphyrius*, nor *Julian the Apostate*, tho' they were not unacquainted with what is said in the New Testament concerning the Taxation of *Cyrenius* under the Reign of *Herod*, never attempted to contradict it; and (t) *Justin Martyr* alledges in his Behalf the Taxation-Books made by *Cyrenius*. *Calvin* and *Salmero* accuse *Josephus* of a Mistake in the time of the Taxation of *Cyrenius*: But, to lay so gross an Error at the Door of so great an Historian, is, in Effect, to call in question the Veracity of his whole History. Neither am I of the same Opinion with *Eusebius* (u), who maintains the Taxation mentioned by (x) *Josephus*, to have been the same

Concerning the Taxation under Cyrenius.

(s) L. 17. c. ult. Ant. & L. 18. c. 1. (t) Apol. 2. pro Christ. (u) L. 1. c. 5. Hist. Eccl. (x) L. 17. c. 15. L. 18. c. 1.

with

with the Taxation, of which mention is made by St. *Luke*, *Spanhemius* having ſufficiently ſhewn the great Difference there is betwixt them. (*y*) *Joh. Georg. Herwart* and (*z*) *Kepler* interpret the Words of St. *Luke* (*a*), thus; that the Genitive Caſe ἡγεμονεύοντος joined with the Word πρώτη, ought to be taken in the Comparative Mood, and ſignifies as much as if it had been ſaid, that this Taxation was the firſt and was made before *Quirinius* or *Cyrenius* was Governour or *Prefect* of *Syria*. But if this had been the Sence of St. *Luke*, he would, queſtionleſs, have expreſs'd it thus: πρότερον τῆ ἡγεμονεύειν, this being more agreeable to the Style of this Evangeliſt. In my Opinion it is the ſafeſt way to conclude, that either *Cyrenius* has been twice Governour of *Syria*, or that he was ſent at the time of the Nativity of our Saviour on purpoſe into *Syria* with full Power to regulate this Taxation; the Word ἡγεμονεύειν implying any ſuperiour Power; and that *Joſephus* did not make mention of it, becauſe it came perhaps never to his Knowledge.

How to reconcile the Synchronism of the 15th year of Tiberius and the 30th of Chriſt.

§. 3. This Character of the Nativity of *Chriſt*, which ought to be conſidered as one of the fundamental ones of this Epocha, has met with dubious Interpretations: For ſome of them explain the Words of (*a*) St. *Luke* thus: *Jeſus began to be thirty years of Age*, &c. Whereas others would have it, *Jeſus was about thirty years of Age*, to wit, *when he began his Miniſtry*. Of the firſt Opinion is *Scaliger*, who (*b*) pretends to evince that *Chriſt* was then entring his 31ſt year of Age. But I am rather inclin'd to believe that the Word ἀρχόμενος is made uſe of here in an Eliptick Senſe; and that it ought to be underſtood as relating to διακονίας or διδάσκειν, or the Miniſtry of *Chriſt*.

(*y*) Chron. c. 241. (*z*) Ecl. Chr. (*a*) C. 2. v. 2. (*b*) C. 3. v. 23. L. 3. Iſag. Chron.

§. 4.

§. 4. This vulgar *Epocha* of the Nativity of *Chriſt* was not only made uſe of by the Chriſtian Writers at the time of *Beda*, but the ſame has alſo met with a Patron among the Modern Authors in the Perſon of *Henr. Harvil.* a *Franciſcan* Fryar, but to no great Purpoſe, it being certain that the ſame is repugnant to the true Computation of the time of *Herod*, and the Synchroniſm of the 15th year of the Reign of *Tiberius*, and the 30th year of the Age of our Saviour, and ſeveral other Eccleſiaſtical Characters beforementioned. *Whether the Vulgar Epocha of Chriſt be the true one.*

§. 5. There is not the leaſt Queſtion but that *Dionyſius*, ſirnamed *Exiguus*, a Native of *Scythia*, and a *Roman* Abbot, was the firſt Author of the Vulgar *Æra* of the Nativity of *Chriſt* about the Year 527; the Ancients accounting their Years before that time, either from the Building of the City of *Rome*, from the *Conſuls*, or the Emperour *Dioclefian*, or from the firſt Indiction. See *W. Langius* (*d*). *Whether Dionyſius Exiguus was the firſt Author of this Epocha.*

§. 6. In the *Roman Martyrology*, publiſhed by the Authority of Pope *Gregory* XIII, and reviſed by the Command of Pope *Urban* VIII, we find theſe following Words, which are every year on the 25th day of *December* read in publick: *In the Year ſince the Creation of the World, when God created Heaven and Earth* 5199: *And ſince the Deluge, in the* 2957*th*; *and the Birth of* Abraham *in the* 2015*th year*: *From* Moſes, *and the time of the* Iſraelites *leaving of* Ægypt, *in the* 1510*th*: *And from the time of* David's *being anointed* King, *in the* 1032*d Year*; *In the* 42*d annual Week of* Daniel; *In the* 194*th Olympiad*: *In the* 752*d Year ſince the Building of* Rome; *in the* 42*d Year of the Reign of the Emperor* Oct. Auguſtus, *when the whole World was bleſſed with Peace. In* *Concerning the Synchroniſms mentioned in the* Roman Martyrology.

(*d*) L. 1. c. 1. de An. Chriſti.

the

the 6th Age of the World, Jesus Christ, *Eternal God, and Son of the Eternal Father, conceived from the Holy Ghost, 9 Months after his Conception was born in* Bethlehem *of* Judæa *from the Virgin* Mary. But the *Roman Catholick* Writers themselves acknowledge the many Contradictions contained in the Synchronisms of this *Martyrology*, as may be seen in *Baronius* and *Dionysius Petavius*; and may be easily refuted out of several of the preceding Chapters.

The different Opinions concerning the Month, and Day of the Nativity of Christ.

§. 7. There being neither the Day nor the Month of the Nativity of *Christ* mentioned in the Holy Scripture, this has given Occasion to several different Opinions. For *(1.)* there are not a few (among whom is *Tho. Lydiott*) who maintains *Christ* to have been born in the Spring, which Opinion was already embraced by some at the time of *Clemens Alexandrinus* and *Paulus*, a Bishop of *Middleburgh* (*e*), in his Treatise of the Day of the Passion of *Christ*, presented to the Emperour *Maximilian*, pretends to fix the Day of the Nativity of *Christ* on the 25th of *March*, exactly at the time of the *Vernal Æquinox*. *(2.)* There are others who affirm that our Saviour was born in Autumn; which Opinion however they pretend to prove by different Arguments: For *Beroaldus* calls to his Aid the half Annual Week mentioned by *Daniel* (*f*), and the *Sabbatick*, and *Jubilean* Years, and the Feasts of Expiation, which had their Beginnings in Autumn; but *Josephus Scaliger* has recourse to the *Levitical* Order instituted by *David* (*g*); from whence he deduces the time of the Ministry of *Zacharias*; and from thence the Conception of *John the Baptist*, and consequently his Birth and the Nativity of our Saviour. *(3.)* Others are of Opinion that *Christ* was born on the 6th day of *January*, which

(*e*) L. 19. c. 4. (*f*) C. 9. (g) 1 Chr. c. 23, v. 27. c. 25. v. 7.

makes

makes *Scaliger* in his Animadverſions upon *Euſebius* affirm, that the whole Chriſtian Church in the Eaſt did at the time of *Euſebius*, and in the preceding and next following Age believe that *Chriſt* was born on the 6th day of *January*, and according to (*a*) *Caſſianus*, the *Ægyptians* did celebrate the Nativity of *Chriſt* on the ſame day. Laſt of all, the moſt general Opinion is, that *Chriſt* was born on the 25th day of *December*, which being maintained by many Learned Men, and among them, by St. *Chryſoſtom*, is received in our Churches, and is moſt agreeable to my Judgment.

CHAP. XLI.

Of the Epocha of the Paſſion of Chriſt.

1. *Chriſt ſuffered after he had for ſome time after his ſolemn Inauguration by the Holy Ghoſt, deſcribed by* (*b*) St. Luke, *taught upon Earth, both by his Words and Deeds; it being evident out of the Hiſtory of the Goſpel, and eſpecially out of the Parable of the fruitleſs Fig-Tree, mentioned by* (*c*) St. Luke, *that our Saviour after the Beginning of his Miniſtry, was ſeveral times preſent at the Solemnity of the Paſſover.*

2. *Chriſt ſuffered when* Joſephus Caiaphas *was High-Prieſt among the* Jews, *as is manifeſt out of* (*d*) St. John, (*e*) St. Luke; *and* (*f*) *the* Acts; *which Dignity he enjoyed from the eighth Year of the Reign of* Tiberius, *and from the* 4741*ſt year*

(*a*) Col. 10. (*b*) C. 3. (*c*) C. 13. v. 7. (*d*) C. 11. v. 49. (*e*) C. 3. v. 2. (*f*) C. 4. v. 6.

of

of the Jul. *Period, till the* 15*th year of the Reign of* Tiberius, *and the* 4748*th year of the* Jul. *Period, when, according to* Joſephus (*g*), *he was depoſed by* Vitellius, *and* Jonathan *the Son of* Annas *ſubſtituted in his Place.*

3. *Chriſt ſuffered when* Pilate *was Præfect of* Palæſtine, *according to the Teſtimony of the Evangeliſts and* (*h*) Joſephus. The firſt Founder of this Name, *ſays* Tacitus (*i*), was *Chriſt*, who under the Reign of *Tiberius* was put to Death by *Pontius Pilate*, then Governour of *Palæſtina. But* Pontius Pilate *was* 10 *years Præfect of* Palæſtina, *to be counted backwards from the Death of* Tiberius, *to wit, from the Year of the* Jul. *Period* 4740, *till the Year of the* Julian *Period* 4750. Vitellius, *ſays* Joſephus (*k*), having made his Friend *Marcellus* Governour of *Judæa* ordered *Pilate* to return to *Rome*, to anſwer before *Cæſar* concerning ſuch Matters as were objected againſt him by the *Jews*. Thus, after he had governed the Province for whole 10 years, being forced to ſubmit to the Orders of *Vitellius*, he undertook a Journey to *Rome*; but before he could reach the City, *Tiberius* died.

4. *When* Herod Antipas *was Tetrarch of* Galilee (*l*), *who afterwards, in the* 4*th year of the Reign of* Caius, *was baniſhed, and* Agrippa *was ſubſtituted in his Place. See* Joſephus (*m*).

5. *When the Full Moon of the Paſſover was coincident with the* 6*th* Feria, *and when our Saviour eat the Paſſover with his Diſciples, See* (*n*) St. John, (*o*) St. Mark, *and* (*p*) St. Luke.

6. *In the ſame year that hapned that notable Eclipſe mentioned by the Evangeliſt* (*q*) *in the following Words*: From the 6th Hour there was Darkneſs over all the Land, unto the 9th Hour:

(*g*) L. 18. c. 3. 6. Antiq. (*h*) L 18. c. 4. (*i*) L. 15. Annal. (*k*) L. 18. c. 5. Antiq. (*l*) Luk. 23. v. 6. (*m*) L. 19. c. 7. Ant. (*n*) C. 19. v. 31. (*o*) C. 15. v. 42. (*p*) C. 23. v. 56. (*q*) Mat. 27. v. 45. Luk. 23. v. 45.

And

And concerning which Eclipſe Phlegon Trallianus *has left a remarkable Obſervation to Poſterity:* In the 4th Year, *ſays he*, of the 202d Olympiad, there hapned the greateſt Eclipſe that ever was known before: For on the 6th Hour, the Day was converted into Night; ſo that the Stars appeared in the Firmament. There was likewiſe felt a great Earthquake in *Bithynia*, which ruined the greateſt part of the City of *Nicea*.

7. *Chriſt ſuffered in the Month* Niſan, *which was the firſt in the Eccleſiaſtical Year, and on the 14th day of the ſame Month, at the time of the Full Moon; according to the Words of God* (r), This Month ſhall be unto you the Beginning of Months; it ſhall be the firſt Month of the Year to you: Speak you unto all the Congregation of *Iſrael*, ſaying, In the 10th day of this Month they ſhall take to them every Man a Lamb, according to the Houſe of their Fathers, a Lamb for an Houſe: And you ſhall keep it up till the 14th day of the ſame Month, and the whole Aſſembly of the Congregation of *Iſrael* ſhall kill it in the Evening: And they ſhall take of the Blood and ſtrike it on the two Side-Poſts, and on the upper Door-Poſt of the Houſes, wherein they ſhall eat it: And they ſhall eat the Fleſh in that Night roſt with Fire, and Unleavened Bread; and with bitter Herbs they ſhall eat it. *Of this ſame Feaſt of the Paſſover*, (s) Philo *has theſe following Words:* On the fourteenth day of the ſame Month, when the Moon is at the Full, the *Jews* celebrate their publick Feaſt of the Paſſover, which the *Chaldæans* call *Paſcha*.

(r) Exod. 12. v. 2. (s) L. 3. de Vit. Moſ.

From these Characters those who adhere to the Opinion of Scaliger *conclude that our Saviour did eat his last Passover (φανερώσιμον) in the Year of the* Julian *Period* 4746, *Cycl.* ☉. 14. ☽. 15, *on the* 3*d day of* April; *and that on the same day, according to the* Jewish *Computation) Christ suffered Death.*

How to find out any year of these Epocha's.

If therefore from any certain year of the Julian *Period,* 4745 *Years and* 3 *Months be subtracted, the Residue shews the year since the Passion of Christ. And if the said* 4745 *Years and* 3 *Months be added to the known Year of this Epocha, the Product will be correspondent to the Year of the* Julian *Period.*

The various Opinions of the Fathers concerning this Epocha.

§. 1. THere are various Opinions concerning the Characters of this *Epocha*; but those before alledged may be look'd upon as the choicest; the Ecclesiastical Characters alledged by the Ancient Fathers, being for the most part involved in many Errors, and contradictory to themselves. The most of them are of Opinion, that our Saviour did not teach in publick above one Year and some Months; and that he was crucified in the 2d Year after his Baptism, which Opinion they found upon the Prophecy of (t) *Isaiah*: *The Spirit of the Lord is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good Tidings unto the Meek; he had sent me to bind up the Broken-hearted, to proclaim Liberty to the Captives, and the opening of the Prison to them that are bound: To proclaim* The ACCEPTABLE YEAR *of the* LORD, *and the Day of Vengeance of our God, to comfort all that mourn.* Which Prophecy is applied to *Christ* by (u) St. *Luke*: So that many of the ancient Fathers have fixed the time of the Death of our Saviour in

(t) C. 61, v. 1. (u) C. 4. v. 19.

the

the 30th year of his Age, and in the 15th or 16th year of the Reign of *Tiberius*, on the 25th day of *March*; which Opinion among the Modern Authors, *Ger.* (x) *Joh. Voſſius* has likewiſe embraced. But as we ſhall have Occaſion to ſhew hereafter, our Saviour did celebrate more Paſſovers after the Beginning of his publick Miniſtry: Neither was the Paſchal Full Moon coincident with the 6th *Feria* in that Year, which is appointed by the Fathers for the Paſſion of Chriſt: Neither is it agreeable to that remarkable Obſervation of the Eclipſe by *Phlegon*: Neither do theſe Fathers agree in their Opinions among themſelves: For *Tertullian*, *Clem. Alexandrinus*, *Julius Africanus*, *Lactantius*, and St. *Auſtin* affirm, that *Chriſt* preached but one Year in publick; whereas St. *Jerome* allows two, *Ignatius* three, and *Irenæus* more years; the laſt of them being of Opinion that *Chriſt* was 50 years old when he ſuffered Death. From whence it appears, that the Opinions of the Fathers concerning this Epocha is built upon a very uncertain Foundation.

How many Paſſovers Chriſt celebrated after the Beginning of his Miniſtry.

§. 2. Among the Ancients, *Beda*; and the Moderns, *Ger. Joh. Voſſius* have made uſe of this Method to inveſtigate the Year of the Paſſion of *Chriſt* from the Number of the Paſſovers celebrated by him after the Beginning of his Miniſtry, tho' it be evident that the laſt is involved in the ſame Difficulties with the firſt; the Chronologers differing as much in their Opinion, if not more, concerning the laſt as the firſt. For Firſt, there are ſome who allow of no more than one Year and a few Months after his Baptiſm, as has been mentioned before. Secondly, Some allow of three Paſſovers after the Baptiſm of our Saviour, among whom is *Epiphanius*, St.

(x) Diſſ. de Temp. Dom. Paſſ.

Hierom, *Beda*, *Nich. de Lyra*, *Alphonſus Toſtatus*, *Pererius*, *Maldonatus*, *Calvinus*, *Muſculus*, *Dionyſius Petavius*, and *Helwigius*. There are, Thirdly, others who affirm that our Saviour did celebrate four Paſſovers after his Baptiſm. The firſt they pretend to prove out of the 2d Chapter, v. 13, 23. of St. *John*; the ſecond out of the 4th Chapter, v. 35. and the 5th Chapter, v. 1, of St. *John*; the third out of the 6th Chap. v. 4. and v. 2. of St. *John*; the 4th out of the 12th Chap. v. 1. of St. *John*, the 22d, Chap. v. 1. of St. *Luke*, the 14th Chap. v. 1. of St. *Mark*, and the 26th Chap. v. 1. of St. *Matthew*: Of which Opinion are (*y*) *Corn. à Lapide*, *Baronius*, *Torniellus*, *Beza*, *Junius*, *Janſenius*, *Henr. Philippi*, *Hugo Grotius*, *Franciſcus Toletus*, *Joh. Wichmannus*, and moſt of the *Dutch* Interpreters. Fourthly, *Scaliger*, *Calviſius*, *Helvicus*, *Calixtus*, *Wilhelm. Langius*, *Cauſabonus*, *Deckerius*, and *Rob. Bailius*, allot 5 Paſſovers after the Baptiſm of Chriſt; and *Jacobus Hainlinus*, who makes the Interval betwixt the Baptiſm and Paſſion of *Chriſt* to conſiſt of 5 years and a half, does likewiſe allow 5 Paſſovers after his Baptiſm. Among theſe different Opinions, we adhere, as we have done frequently before, to that of *Scaliger*. But the Difficulty is how to prove this 5th Paſſover out of the Holy Scripture, which has been attempted by ſome, by comparing Chap. 12. v. 1. of St. *Matthew*, with the 6th Chap. v. 1. & *ſequ.* of St. *Luke*; Alſo by comparing the 9th Chap. v. 51. of St. *Luke*, with his 10th Chap. v. 8. and 38. But it is our Opinion that we need not be ſo very anxious in finding out the 5th Paſſover in the Holy Scripture; ſince, tho' the ſame be not expreſly mentioned, yet no Inference is to be drawn from thence, that the ſame

(*y*) Nat. ad Joh. 5.

may

may be proved from other undeniable Circumstances.

§. 3. *Alphonsus, Tostatus, Fran. Toletus, Corn. à Lapide, Baronius, Henr. Broughton, Joh. Cloppenburgius*, and several others, are of Opinion that our Saviour did celebrate the last Passover with the *Jews*; but against all Reason, as has been allowed by *Causabonus*. For the Day of the Passion of Christ on which our Saviour did likewise eat the Passover, is expressly called (z) παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα, *the Preparation of the Passover*; and Supper being ended, (a) πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα, *before the Feast of the Passover he washed the Feet of his Disciples*. And the Reason why the *Jews* would not enter the Judgment-Hall, was (b) ἵνα φάγωσι τὸ πάσχα, *that they might eat the Passover*. And there is but little likelihood that the *Pharisees*, who were so very superstitious in observing all the nicest Points of the Ceremonial Law, would have prophaned this Feast by the Accusation of *Christ*, when the pious Women were so scrupulous as not to dare to buy Spices and Ointments. See St. (c) *Mark* and St. (d) *John*. *Christ did not celebrate the last Passover with the Jews.*

§. 4. There is a great Dispute, which is not easily decided among the Interpreters, whether *Christ* eat the last Passover on the 14th day of the first Month, according to the Institution of the Law, or whether he celebrated it before the Full Moon. Those who adhere to the *Greek* Church are of Opinion that *Christ* did celebrate the last Passover ἀνομάλως: But when we consider that *Christ* subjected himself to the Law, this Opinion carries along with it but little Probability. Besides that, the Words of *Christ* to his (e) Apostles sufficiently imply the time of the *Whether Christ did celebrate the Passover on the 14th day of the Month.*

(z) Joh. c. 19. v. 14. (a) C. 13. v. 1. (b) C. 18. v. 28. (c) C. 16. v. 1. (d) C. 14. v. 42. (e) Mat. 26. v. 17. Mar. 14. v. 12.

Paſſover; and how can it be ſuppoſed that thoſe who let not ſlip the leaſt Opportunity of ſlandering our Saviour, ſhould have paſs'd by in Silence ſuch a Treſpaſs againſt the Law. *Hugo Grotius* makes a Diſtinction betwixt πάσχα θυσιμον and μνεμονευτικὸν; The firſt, he ſays, was celebrated at *Jeruſalem*, according to the Inſtitution of the Law, at a certain prefixed time, when the Paſchal Lambs were killed only by the Prieſts and Levites. The ſecond, he ſays, was the ſame which is to this day celebrated by the *Jews* in other Parts, where they only eat Unleavened Bread with a few bitter Herbs; and this he ſuppoſes was the ſame celebrated by our Saviour before his Paſſion. But it is abſolutely falſe, that according to God's Inſtitution, the Prieſts alone were to kill the Paſchal Lamb, as may be ſeen in (*f*) *Exodus* and (*g*) *Leviticus*; and the contrary is teſtified by (*h*) *Joſephus* and (*i*) *Philo*, with whom agree *Lorinus* the Jeſuite, *Corn. à Lapide*, *Dorſheus* and *Wil. Langius*. And it is worth Obſervation, that *Chriſt* did not command his Diſciples to prepare only Unleavened Bread with bitter Herbs: but ſeveral times makes mention of the Paſchal Lamb: And, acording to (*k*) *Joh. Buxtorfius*, when the *Jews* celebrate the πάσχα μνημονευτικὸν they never eat the Paſchal Lamb, neither in ancient nor our Times. To reſolve in ſome meaſure this Difficulty, it ſeems, that purſuant to the ancient Traditions of the *Rabbi's*, the *Phariſees*, who cloſely adhered to them, never celebrated the Paſſover on the 2d, 4th, and 6th *Feria*, notwithſtanding that the Moon was at the Full. But on the other hand, ſuch among the *Jews* as were not ſo much addicted to theſe Traditions, did eat the Paſſover at the time of the *Paſchal Pleni-*

(*f*) C. 12. (*g*) C. 23. (*h*) L. 2. c. 5. Ant. (*i*) L. 3. vit. Moſ. (*k*) Syn. Jud. c. 12, 13, 14.

lune

lune. So that our Saviour celebrated the Paſſover with his Diſciples at the time of the Full Moon, in the firſt Month, which was in that Year on the 6th *Feria*; whereas the *Phariſees*, purſuant to their Traditions, did not eat it till on the 7th *Feria*; but durſt not object any thing of this nature to our Saviour, for fear of diſobliging ſuch as celebrated the ſame Paſſover on the 6th *Feria*. I am not ignorant that there are not a few among the Learned, among whom is *Ger. Joh. Voſſius*, who are of Opinion that this Tranſlation of the Feaſts is not ſo ancient: But, that this Tranſlation of the Feaſts is of a very ancient Offspring among the *Jews*, is ſufficiently ſhewn by *Scaliger*, *Iſ. Cauſabonus*, *Sebaſtianus Munſterius*, *Corn. Janſenius*, *Joh. Mariana*, and *Paulus Middleburgenſis*, out of the Fragments of *Gamaliel* and other moſt ancient Monuments. And it is beyond all Reaſon what is alledged by *Voſſius*, to wit, that the 14th day of the Month could fall out before the *Æquinox*; it being unqueſtionable, that, according to the *Jewiſh* Calendary, the N. Moon of the firſt Month was always next preceding the *Vernal Æquinox*. *Scaliger* and *Schimidius* come much nearer to the Point, when they aſſert, that ſome among the *Jews* following their ancient Traditions, uſed to transfer the Feaſt of the Paſſover from the 14th Day of the firſt Month to the next following Sabbath.

§. 5. It is evident, both from the Words of the Holy Scripture, and the Teſtimony of *Joſephus*, that *Caiaphas* was High-Prieſt at the time of the Paſſion of *Chriſt*. The only Objection is taken from the 3d Chapter, ver. 2. of St. *Luke*, where it is ſaid *Annas* and *Caiphas* being the High-Prieſts, the Word of God came unto *John*. See the (*l*) *Acts*: Which Objection

Who was High-Prieſt among the Jews at the time of the Paſſion of Chriſt.

(*l*) C. 4. v. 6.

is ſufficiently anſwered by (*m*) *Scaliger*; to wit, that *Annas* was not actually High-Prieſt at that time, but only his Vicar to ſupply his Place upon any emergent Occaſion. Others will have it, that the Dignity of the High-Pontiff being for Life, they always retained the Name though they were depoſed, as *Annas* was who was mentioned here, in the firſt place by reaſon of his great Authority, as having been High-Prieſt himſelf, and ſeen both his own Son and Son-in-Law in the ſame eminent Station.

Whether that Eclipſe which happned at the time of the Paſſion of Chriſt was ſupernatural and univerſal.

§. 6. The miraculous Eclipſe which hapned at the time of the Paſſion of *Chriſt*, was both ſupernatural and univerſal: Supernatural, becauſe it hapned in the Full Moon; it being evident, that ſince the *Solar Eclipſes* are cauſed by the Interpoſition of the Moon betwixt the Sun and the Eyes of the Beholders, the ſame could not happen according to the ordinary Courſe of Nature: Univerſal, according to the Words of the Evangeliſts St. (*n*) *Matthew* and St. (*o*) *Luke*, which is likewiſe confirmed by the Dialogue betwixt *Dionyſius* and *Apollophanes* recited by *Suidas* in his Lexicon upon the Word *Dionyſius*; where, among other things, *Dionyſius* anſwered *Apollophanes* concerning this Eclipſe: *Aut Deus patitur, aut vicem Patientis deflet; Either God himſelf ſuffers, or elſe is extremely concerned about him that ſuffers:* Which contradicts the Opinions of *Origenes*, *Laur. Valla*, *Eraſmus Roterdamus*, and *Iſ. Peyrerius*, who maintain that this was only a particular Eclipſe which was not obſerved at *Athens*, or any other Place beyond the Horizon of *Jeruſalem*. And the Authority and Teſtimony of *Phlegon* makes it one of the moſt unqueſtionable Characters of the time of the Paſſion of *Chriſt*.

(*m*) Prol. in Euſeb. (*n*) C. 27. v. 45. (*o*) C. 23. v. 44.

§. 7.

§. 7. *Christ* suffered on the 6th *Feria*; For the Day on which *Christ* was crucified, is called by (*p*) St. *Mark* and (*q*) St. *John* προσάββατον; which is *Preparation*, or the *Day before the Sabbath*. 2. It is said, that the Women staid but one Day before they came to the Sepulchre. See St. *Luke*, c. 23. 3. The *Syrian* and *Arabick* Interpreters unanimously agree that *Christ* suffered on the *Friday*; as 4. do the most ancient Fathers and Ecclesiastical Writers. 5. It is confirmed by the Calculation of the *Paschal Plenilune*, which was coincident with the 33d Year of *Christ*, which *Plenilune* did happen that same Year on the 6th *Feria*. All which sufficiently contradicts the Assertion of *Paulus Middleburgensis* and *Willhelmus Langius*, that *Christ* suffered on the 5th *Feria*, or on *Thursday*. What they alledge for themselves, that it is said in (*r*) *Matthew*, That the Son of Man shall be three Days and three Nights in the Heart of the Earth, some compute from the first Beginning of *Christ's* Passion; others interpret it by three νυχθήμερα, containing two Nights and one Day.

Christ suffered on the 6th Feria.

(*p*) C. 15. v. 42. (*q*) C. 19. v. 31. (*r*) C. 12. v. 40.

CHAP.

CHAP. XLII.

Of the Epocha of the laſt Deſtruction of the City of Jeruſalem.

For the better underſtanding of this Epocha, theſe following Chararacters ought to be taken into Conſideration.

1. *The* Jewiſh *War (in the fourth Year of which* Jeruſalem *was taken) began in the ſecond year after* Florus *was made Governour of that Province; and in the 12th year of the Reign of* Nero. *See (a)* Joſephus. The *Jews* bore it patiently, *ſays (b)* Tacitus, till the time when *Geſſius Florus* was made Governour; then the War began to break out, when *Ceſtius Gallus*, then Deputy-Governour of *Syria* endeavouring to force them to a Compliance, they were vanquiſhed in ſeveral Engagements.
2. *This Deſtruction of* Jeruſalem *hapned at the time of the Expiration of the 70 Angelical Weeks, which, according to the Words of the Prophet (c)* Daniel *were determined upon the People and the Holy City.*
3. *This Deſtruction of Jeruſalem hapned in the 2d year of the Reign of* Flavius Veſpaſianus, *according to (d)* Joſephus *and (e)* Euſebius. *The Reign of* Veſpaſian *commences with the firſt*

(a) Lib. 20. c. ult. Ant. (b) L. 5. Hiſtor. (c) C. 9. v. 24. (d) L. 6. c. 47. de bell. Jud. (e) In Chron.

day

day of July (*when* Tiberius Alexander, *then Governour of* Ægypt, *firſt induced the Legions to ſwear Fealty to* Veſpaſian) *in the* 2*d year after the Death of* Nero: *For (according to (f)* Dio Caſſius, *there was an Interval of a whole Year and* 22 *Days betwixt the Death of* Nero *and the Beginning of the Reign of* Veſpaſian) *I ſay, in the ſame Year when the Battle was fought near* Cremona, *and* Vitellius *was ſlain on the day of the Feaſt of* Saturn. *See (g)* Tacitus: *And about which time hapned a notable Eclipſe of the Moon, which contributed not a little towards increaſing the Tumult and Mutiny in* Vitellius's *Army. See (h)* Dio. *Such an Eclipſe hapned in the Year of the Vulgar Æra of Chriſt* 69, *on the* 18*th day of* October, *as may be eaſily inveſtigated by the Aſtronomical Calculations.*

4. *It was the* 2*d Year of the* 212*th Olympiad when the* Romans *made themſelves Maſters of the City of* Jeruſalem. *See (i)* Euſeb.

5. *The Deſtruction of* Jeruſalem *hapned in the ſame year that* Fl. Veſp. Auguſtus *a ſecond time, and* Titus *were* Roman *Conſuls. See (k)* Dio Caſſius.

6. *It was the* 331*ſt Year before the Conſulſhip of* Stilico *and* Aurelianus, *when the City of* Jeruſalem *was taken by the* Romans. *See* Sulpit. Severus.

7. Titus *began the Siege of* Jeruſalem *on the firſt day of the Unleavened Bread, on the* 14*th day of the Month* Xanticus, *on the ſame day that the* Jews *were freed from the* Ægyptian *Bondage. See (l)* Joſephus.

8. *The Temple was laid in Aſhes on the* 10*th day of the Month* Lous, *on the ſame Day that the Temple was deſtroyed by Fire by the King of*

(*f*) L. 66. (*g*) L. 3. (*h*) L. 65. (*i*) In Chron. (*k*) L. 66. (*l*) L. 5. c. 11. de Bel. Jud.

Ba-

Babylon. *See* (*m*) Josephus *and* Seder Olam.

9. *The City was taken on the* 8*th day of the Month* Gorpiæus, *and upon a* Saturday, *which Day is in great Veneration among the* Jews *to this Day. See* Josephus *and* (*n*) Dio Cassius.

From these Characters it is evident that Titus *began the Siege of* Jerusalem *in the Year of the* Julian *Period* 4783, *Cycl.* ☉. 23. ☽. 14. *on the* 14*th day of* April; *and that the Temple was laid in Ashes on the* 6*th day of* August *in the same Year; and the total Desolation of the City on the first of* September.

Any certain year given of the Julian *Period to find out the year since the beginning of this Epocha.*

If therefore from any certain Year of the Julian *Period be subtracted* 4782 *Years and* 3 *Months, or* 7 *Months, or* 8 *Months, the Residue shews the Year since the beginning of the Siege of* Jerusalem, *and the Destruction of the Temple and City. On the other hand, if to the known Years of this Epocha the before-mentioned Sum of Years and Months be added, the Product will be correspondent to the Year of the* Julian *Period.*

Where we must look for the Chronology of this Epocha.

§. 1. THE true Chronology of the Destruction of *Jerusalem* must chiefly be looked for in the Books of *Josephus*, he having been at the same time a Prisoner in the *Roman* Camp, and employed by them as a Messenger to the Besieged. And tho' the *Jewish Rabbi's*, but especially *Rabbi Isaac Abarbinel*, do exclaim against his Authority, yet their Calumnies are of little Consequence against so great an Historian, it being certain that the *Rabbi's* themselves are Ignorant as to the true time of the Destruction of their City, as we shall have Occasion to shew immediately.

(*m*) L. 7. c. 9, 10. (*n*) L. 66.

§. 2.

§. 2. The *Rabbi's* in their Chronological Treatises relate this Destruction in the following Words; especially in their *Great Chronicle*: *From the time of the War of* Vespasian, *till the War of* Titus, *are* 24 *Years*: *From the time of the War of* Titus, *till the War with* Barcozbe 16 *Years*. *Thus, according to* Rabbi Jose, *the days of good Works and Sins, return within one another. As for Example, the first Temple was destroyed on the Eve of the Sabbath, towards the latter end of the* 7th *Year*; *and it was likewise in the Week of the Station of* Joarib, *and the* 9th *day of the Month* Ab. *In the same Manner happed the* 2d *Destruction. And at both times the* Levites *were singing the* Canticle; *And what* Canticle? *God our Lord will return upon their Heads their Iniquity, and destroy them in their Malice*, &c. In the other Chronological Treatise written by *Rabbi David Ganz*, they indeed own that Expedition of *Fl. Vespasian* and *Tit. Vespasian* to have been the same; but at the same time relate Matters in a very different manner concerning *Josephus*, and the Destruction of the Temple to the 3828th Year after the Creation, and the 420th Year after its first Foundation. All which is a convincing Argument of the Ignorance of the *Jews* in relation to their own History, and the Destruction of their City. *Concerning the Jewish Computation of this Epocha.*

§. 3. We have already said in the foregoing Chapter, that the Fathers have too much contracted that Interval betwixt the time of the Baptism and Passion of Christ, from whence it is evident that their Computations of the Interval betwixt the Passion of Christ and the Destruction of *Jerusalem* being built upon an erroneous Hypothesis, no great Account is to be made upon their Opinions in this Point. *Concerning the Computation of the Fathers of this Epocha.*

§. 4.

Whether the Destruction of the City happened in the 71st year of Christ.

§. 4. (o) *Joh. Jac. Hainlinus* is of Opinion, that the Destruction of the City of *Jerusalem* happened in the 71st year of Christ, and in the 4784th year of the *Jul. Period*; But this Opinion being founded upon the Fictitious Hypothesis of his Mystical Years, is directly repugnant to the Ancient History: Neither is it possible to find out an Expedient to make the Month of *September* of the 71st year of Christ coincident with the 2d year of the Reign of *Vespasian*, as our Author would willingly persuade the World.

What Months are understood by Josephus *in his Relation of the Destruction of* Jerusalem.

§. 5. It is a very difficult Task to explain the Foreign Names of the Months mentioned by *Josephus* in his Relation of the Destruction of *Jerusalem*: For in his 6th Book Ch. 4. (p he says, the Siege began on the 14th day of the Month *Xanticus*: And in the same Book, in the 8th Chapter, he says, that the *Romans* made themselves Masters of the first Wall on the 5th day of the Month *Artemisius*. Thus he frequently makes mention of the Month *Lous*, and refers the total Desolation of the City to the 8th day of the Month *Gorpiæus*. It is beyond all dispute, that *Josephus* had borrowed these Names from the *Macedonians*, who being subdued by the *Romans*, had been forced to change their Ancient *Lunar Calendar* for the *Solar* of the *Romans*. The *Macedonian* Months do thus correspond with the *Julian*:

Audinæus,	*January.*
Peritius,	*February.*
Dystius,	*March.*
Xanthicus,	*April.*
Artemisius,	*May.*

(o) De usu Tab. p. 59. (p) De Bel. Jud.

Dæ-

Dæsius,	*June.*
Panemus,	*July.*
Lous,	*August.*
Gorpiæus,	*September.*
Hyperberetæus,	*October.*
Dius,	*November.*
Apellæus,	*December.*

But whether *Josephus* by the Names of these *Macedonian* Months did understand them according to the *Julian* Months, is a great Question: *Ruffinus*, *Josephus Scaliger*, *Calvisius*, Archbishop *Usher*, and many others, are of this Opinion: But for my part, I am rather inclined to believe that *Josephus* by these *Macedonian* Names did understand the *Jewish* Months. For it is expressly said by *Josephus*, that his Countrymen did go out of *Ægypt* on the same 14th day of the Month *Xanthicus* when *Titus* began to invest the City of *Jerusalem*; and it being unquestionable that this was the 14th of the Month *Nisan*, there is but little Probability that *Josephus* intended to make this day of the Month *Nisan* correspondent with a certain Day of the *Julian* Calendar: And the Characters of the Epocha of the Departure of the *Jews* out of *Ægypt* shewing most evidently that the *Jews* did depart out of *Ægypt*, not on the 14th but 16th day of *April*, we may rationally conclude, that *Josephus* did by the Month *Xanthicus* understand the Month *Nisan*; on the 14th day of which Month the Feast of the Passover was constantly kept by the *Jews*. Secondly, it is not very probable that the *Jews* should refer the Day of the first Destruction of their Temple to any certain Day of the *Julian* Calendar, which was not as much as thought of at that time, it being mention'd by *Josephus*, that on the 10th day of the Month *Lous* likewise the first Temple was destroyed by Fire. I see no Reason why by the Month

Month *Lous* ſhould not be underſtood the Month called *AB* by the Ancient *Jews*. Thus the Words of the Prophet *Jeremiah* (*q*) may be reconciled with the Relation of *Joſephus*: *In the Month*, ſays the Prophet, *on the* 10*th day of the Month* (*AB*) *which was the* 19*th year of* Nebuchadnezzar *King of* Babylon, *came* Nebuzaradan *Captain of the Guard, which ſerved the King of* Babylon *into* Jeruſalem, *and burned the Houſe of the Lord*, &c.

According to this Hypotheſis the Months are as follows:

Xanthicus,	*Niſan.*
Artemiſius,	*Giar.*
Dæſius,	*Sivan.*
Panemus,	*Tamutz.*
Lous,	*Ab.*
Gorpiæus,	*Elul.*
Hyperberetæus,	*Tiſri.*
Dius,	*Marcheſvan.*
Apellæus,	*Caſleu.*
Audinæus,	*Tebeth.*
Peritius,	*Schebath.*
Dyſtius,	*Adar.*

How often Jeruſalem was taken.

§. 6. It is commonly ſuppoſed, that *Jeruſalem* was taken but twice; and that not altogether without Reaſon, if it be underſtood in reference of its total Deſtruction. Nevertheleſs (*r*) *Joſephus* affirms that it was taken five ſeveral times before it was deſtroyed by *Titus*. Jeruſalem, ſays he, *was taken five times before*; *By* Aſoch *the* Ægyptian *King, and after him by* Antiochus, *then by* Pompey, *and after theſe by* Herod *and* Soſias, *who preſerved the City*: *But before that time, the King of* Babylon *had laid it quite deſolate*. Which

(*q*) C. 52. v. 12. (*r*) L. 8. c. 10. de Bell. Jud.

ſuffi-

ſufficiently contradicts that Vain-glorious Inſcription mentioned by (s) *Juſtus Lipſius*, which is as follows:

IMP. TITO. CÆSARI DIVI VESPASIANI. F. VESPASIANO. AUG. PONTIFICI. MAXIMO. TRIB. POT. X. IMP. XVII. COS. VIII. P. P. PRINCIPI SUO. S.P.Q.R.

QUOD. PRÆCEPTIS. PATRIS. CONSILIISQUE. ET. AUSPICIIS. GENTEM. JUDÆORUM. DOMUIT. ET. URBEM. HIEROSOLYMAM. OMNIBUS. ANTE. SE. DUCIBUS. REGIBUS. GENTIBUSQUE. AUT. FRUSTRA. PETITAM. AUT. OMNINO. INTENTATAM. DELEVIT.

The Temple deſtroyed by Titus was the 2d Temple.

§. 7. The Temple Deſtroyed by *Titus*, is generally called the ſecond Temple: For tho', according to (t) *Joſephus*, *Herod* did demoliſh the Temple, and built a new one inſtead of it; yet this being done only with an Intention to render the Structure of the Temple the more Magnificent; and having no relation to its interiour Parts, is therefore not called the 3d, but the 2d Temple.

How many of the Jews periſhed in the Siege and the whole War.

§. 8. *Joſephus* affirms, that in the Siege, and taking of the City of *Jeruſalem* there periſhed of the *Jews* 1100000, which is confirmed by (u) *Euſebius*, (x) *Oroſius*, and *Sulpitius Severus*: But *J. Lipſius* has computed the whole Number of the *Jews* ſlain and taken Priſoners in their Civil and Foreign Wars within the ſpace of the laſt 7 Years in the following manner:

(s) Inſcr. Ant. fol. 154. (t) L. 15. c. 14. Ant. (u) In Chron. (x) L. 7. c. 6.

At *Jerusalem* by the Command of *Florus*,	630
At *Cæsarea* by the Inhabitants,	20000
At *Scythopolis*,	13000
In *Askalon*,	2500
At *Ptolemais*,	2000
At *Alexandria*,	50000
At *Damascus*,	10000
At the taking of *Joppa*,	8400
In the Mount *Cabulon*,	2000
In the Battle near *Ascalon*,	10000
By Surprise,	8000
At *Aphac*,	15000
In the Mount [illegible]*im*,	11600
At *Jotap*,	30000
At the taking of *Joppa* a second time,	4200
Near *Taricha*,	6500
At *Gamala*,	9000
In their Flight from *Gischala*, slain	2000
Taken	3000
Of those of *Gadar*, slain	13000
taken	2200
Slain in *Idumæa*,	10000
At *Gera*,	1000
At *Macheron*,	1700
In the Forest of *Jardes*,	3000
In the Castle of *Massada*,	960
At *Cyrene*,	3000
During the Siege of *Jerusalem*,	1000000
made Prisoners,	97000
The whole Number,	1339690

Whether the Kingdom of the Jews ceased with the Destruction of Jerusalem.

§. 9. According to the *Latin* Version of the *Chronicon* of *Eusebius* translated by St. *Hierome*, and the *Chronicle* of the before-mentioned *Rabbi David Ganz*, the Royal Dignity was quite abolished among the *Jews* at the time of the last Destruction of the Temple; which is contradicted by *Scaliger*, who demonstrates by a certain Coin

Coin with this Inſcription, *Poſt captam Judæam adhuc erat* Βασιλεὺς Ἀγρίππας, that *Agrippa* did not die in the 3d Year of the 212th Olympiad. We agree thus far with *Scaliger*, That *Agrippa* did retain the Royal Title after the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*; of which *Photius* in (*y*) μυριοβίβλῳ, has theſe following Words: *The Chronicle of* Juſtus Tiberienſis *was read, which had for its Title* THE HISTORY OF JUSTUS TIBERIENSIS OF ALL SUCH AS WERE CROWNED KINGS OF THE JEWS. *This Author was a Native of* Tiberias, *a City in* Galilee, *which has given him his Sirname. He begins his Hiſtory with* Moſes, *which he continues till the Death of* Agrippa, *the 7th King of the Family of* Herod, *and the laſt of the* Jewiſh *Kings. He received the Crown under the Reign of* Claudius; *his Power encreaſed by* Nero, *and became more potent under* Veſpaſian. *He died in the third Year of the Reign of* Trajan, *with which Year he concludes his Hiſtory.* But it is very evident out of ſeveral Paſſages in *Joſephus*, that *Agrippa* was neither King of the *Jews* nor *Jeruſalem*: For he allows him not the leaſt Authority over *Judæa*, unleſs what concerned the (*z*) Temple; but ſays, (*a*) that by the Favour of *Claudius* he was put in the Poſſeſſion of the Kingdom of *Chalcis*, and by *Nero* regaled with the Cities of *Tiberias*, *Tarichæa* and *Julia*, with 14 other Towns of leſs Note: And that the whole *Judæa*, the greateſt part of *Galilee* and *Samaria*, was under the Juriſdiction of the *Roman* Præfects, is, according to the Teſtimony of *Joſephus*, paſt all Diſpute.

(*y*) Cod. 33. (*z*) L. 20. c. 8. Ant. (*a*) L. 20. c. 3, 5.

CHAP. XLIII.

Of the Epocha of Diocleſian, *which is commonly called by the* Ægyptians *the* ÆRA OF MARTYRS, *by* Euſebius *the* ÆRA διωγμῦ, *or of* Perſecution, *by the* Æthiopians *the* ÆRA OF GRACE, *and by the* Mahometans *the* ÆRA ELKUPTI.

1. *The* Æra *of Diocleſian begins in the ſame Year that* Diocleſian, *after the Death of* Carus *and* Numerianus, *was declared Emperour.*
2. *The Emperour* Diocleſian *entred* Nicomedia *in Triumph on the 15th day of* September, *and the firſt of* January *following appeared in publick as Conſul.*
3. *About that time* Carinus *the 2d time, and* Numerianus *were* Roman *Conſuls, who were ſucceeded by* Diocleſian (*already declared* Auguſtus) *and* Ariſtobulus. *This is not only thus related in the* Chronicon Alexandrinum, *but alſo by* (*a*) Ammianus Marcellinus, *who ſays expreſly that when* Diocleſian *was Conſul with* Ariſtobulus, *he was dignified with the Title of* Auguſtus. *And thus we find it recorded in the Publick Records called* Faſti Capitolini, *IMP. CÆS. C. AURELIO DIOCLESIANO AUG. II ..... ARISTOBULUS.*

(*a*) Lib. 23.

4.

4. *The 3d* Indiction *then began with the Month of* September, *according to the* Chronicon Alexandrinum.

5. *The first year of the Reign of* Diocleſian *is coincident with the 2301ſt year of the Epocha of* Abraham; *unto which if 2696 years be added, the Product ſhews the year of the* Julian *Period, as has been demonſtrated before*, *according to* Euſeb. in Chron.

6. In the 89th year ſince the Beginning of the Reign of *Diocleſian*, *ſays* (*b*) St. Ambroſe, the Full Moon falling then out upon the 21ſt day of *March*, we did celebrate *Eaſter* upon the laſt day of *March*. Thoſe of *Alexandria* and other Places in *Ægypt*, the Full Moon happening with them on the 28th day of the Month *Phamenoth*, did celebrate their *Eaſter* on the 5th day of the Month *Pharmuthi*, which was, like among us, the laſt day of *March*. Again, in the 93d year ſince the Beginning of the Reign of *Diocleſian*, it being then Full Moon, on the 14th day of the Month *Pharmuth*, and *Sunday*, they celebrated *Eaſter* on the next following 21ſt day of the ſame Month, which, according to our Calendar, is the 14th day of *April*.

7. *The 92d year ſince the Beginning of the Reign of* Diocleſian *is coincident with the 12th year of the Reign of* Valentinian *and* Valens, *and the 8th of* Gratian.

8. *It was in the 248th year ſince the Beginning of the Reign of this Tyrant, when* Dionyſius, *ſirnamed* Exiguus, *firſt began his* Paſchal Cycle, *according to* Dionyſius Exiguus *himſelf, in his firſt Epiſtle, mentioned by* (*c*) Dionyſius Petavius. *Conſult alſo* (*d*) Beda.

(*b*) L. 10. Ep. 83. ad Epiph. (*c*) Append. de Doct. Temp. (*d*) C. 45. de Rat. Temp.

9. *The* Ægyptians *began the Years of the* Æra *of* Diocleſian *with the Month* Thot, *being our 29th day of* Auguſt.

10. In the ſame Year that *Diocleſian* a ſecond time and *Ariſtobulus*, were Conſuls at *Rome*, *Carinus Margo* was ſlain, and *Diocleſianus* was exalted to the Empire. *Thus ſays* (*e*) Idacius.

11. *In the 19th year of the Reign of* Diocleſian, *in the Month* Dyſtrius, (*which is among the* Romans *the Month of* March) Eaſter *being near at Hand, the Emperour cauſed a Proclamation to be publiſhed, that all the Churches ſhould be pulled down and laid level with the Ground; that all their Papers ſhould be burnt, and the* Chriſtians *be deprived of all their Places and Dignities; and that ſuch among them as perſevered in their Faith ſhould be accounted infamous and be made Slaves. Of which ſee* Euſebius (*f*), Metrophanes *and* Alexander *in* (*g*) Photius; *as likewiſe* Ignatius *the Patriarch of* Antioch *of which mention is made by* Scaliger (*h*).

12. *In the ſame year, being the 19th of the Reign of* Diocleſian, *and the firſt of the Perſecution,* Diocleſian *was the 8th time, and* Maximianus *the 7th time* Roman *Conſuls, according to* Idacius.

13. *The year when* Diocleſian *began the Perſecution againſt the Chriſtians, was coincident with the 351ſt year ſince the Beginning of the* Antiochian *Epocha, according to* Euſebius in Chron.

14. *In the 2d year of the Perſecution* Diocleſian *did abdicate himſelf at* Nicomedia, *and* Maximin. *at* Milan. *See* (*i*) Euſ. Idac. Eutrop.

(*e*) in Faſt. (*f*) L. 8. c. 3. Hiſt. Eccl. (*g*) Cod. 256. (*h*) L. 5. p. 492. de Em. Temp. (*i*) L. 8. c. 9. *Hiſt.* Eccl.

15. *It was in the* 3*d year of the Perſecution raiſed againſt the Chriſtians by* Domitian, *when* Conſtantius *died, according to* Metrophanes *and* Alexander *in* (*k*) Photius. *But the time of the Death of* Conſtantius *is thus expreſſed by* (*l*) Socrates: Conſtantius *was proclaimed King in* Britain *inſtead of his Father* Conſtantius, *in the firſt year of the* 271*ſt Olympiad, on the* 25*th day of* July.

16. *In the* 4*th year of the Perſecution* Conſtantine *began his Reign, according to* Euſeb. *in* Chron.

17. *In the* 19*th year of the Reign of* Dioclesian, *in the Month of* March, *in* Euſter *time, the Chriſtian Churches were pulled down, according to* St. Hieron *in* Chron. Euſeb.

From theſe, and innumerable other Characters, too many to be inſerted here, it is evident, that Dioclesian *was declared* Auguſtus *in the year of the* Julian *Period* 4997, *Cycl.* ☉. 13. ☽. 19. *on the* 17*th day of* September; *and that the* Ægyptians *began this Æra on the* 29*th day of* Auguſt; *and that the Perſecution againſt the Chriſtians began in the year of the* Julian *Period* 5016, *Cycl.* ☉. 4. ☽. 19. *in the Month of* March.

If therefore 4996 *years and* 8 *Months be ſubtracted from any certain year of the* Julian *Period, the Reſidue ſhews the year ſince the beginning of the Æra of* Dioclesian: *And if in the ſame manner* 5015 *Years and* 3 *Months be ſubtracted, the Reſidue will be correſpondent to the year ſince the Beginning of the Perſecution raiſed by* Dioclesian *againſt the Chriſtians. But if you deſire to inveſtigate the Year of the* Julian *Period, you muſt add the above-mentioned Number of Years and Months to the known Year of theſe Epocha's.* How to find out any year of theſe Epocha's.

(*k*) Cod. 256. (*l*) L. 1. c. 1.

Whether this Epocha begins with the Reign of Diocleſian.

§. 1. (*m*) *Scaliger* is of Opinion that this Epocha began three years or more before *Diocleſian* was declared Emperour and *Auguſtus*; but in my Opinion, he has been miſguided in this Point by *Aurel. Caſſiodorus*, who has confounded in ſo miſerable a manner the Years of the Reign of *Diocleſian*, that there is not the leaſt Reaſon to follow his Footſteps.

Whether the Ancients began this Epocha from the time of the Perſecution.

§. 2. The Ancients were for the moſt part of this Opinion, that the Epocha of *Diocleſian* had its Beginning from the time of the Perſecution raiſed by this Tyrant againſt the Chriſtians, as may be ſeen out of the (*n*) Epiſtle of *Ignatius* the Patriarch of *Antiochia* written to *Scaliger* upon this Account: 'You are alſo, ſays he, very 'deſirous to be informed concerning the ÆRA 'of MARTYRS uſed among the *Ægyptians*, 'its true Origin and Denomination: You muſt 'know then that it has its Beginning from the '19th Year of the Reign of that impious '(*Sic*) King *Diocleſian*; at which time he rai-'ſed the moſt Violent Perſecution againſt the 'Chriſtians, ordering their Churches to be de-'moliſhed; and that ſuch as refuſed to pay Ado-'ration to the Idols, ſhould be killed. Purſuant 'to this Edict, there were alone in *Ægypt* one 'hundred and forty four thouſand and ſeven hun-'dred Believers ſacrificed to his Fury: From 'which time began the ÆRA ELKUPTI, or 'the ÆRA of MARTYRS, whoſe Blood was 'ſhed by *Diocleſian*. But it is apparent that this Patriarch is under a Miſtake; and that he has confounded the Year of the Beginning of his Reign with that of his Perſecution againſt the Chriſtians. And it is not altogether improbable, but that the *Ægyptians*, to aboliſh the Memory

(*m*) L. 5. de Em. Temp. p. 494. (*n*) L. 5. p. 496. de Em. Temp.

of

of this Tyrant, have changed this Epocha, which had borrowed its Name from *Diocleſian* into that of the MARTYRS.

§. 3. There is no great Difficulty in finding out the Congruity there is betwixt the Months of this Epocha and the *Julian* Months, if it be taken into Conſideration that the Years of the *Æra* of *Diocleſian*, or of the MARTYRS, both in reſpect of their Quantity and the Order of the *Biſſextiles* or Leap-Years, agree for the moſt part with the *Julian* Years: For they do, like us, intercalate a Day at certain times. The whole Difference lies in the Quantity of the Months and the Beginning of the Year: For the *Ægyptians* have made their Months all τριακονθήμερους, and begin their Year with the 29th day of *Auguſt*, adding to the common Year, after the Month *Meſori*, five *Epagomenæ's*; and to the Leap-Year ſix *Epagomenæ's*. The following Table ſhews the true Connection betwixt ours and the *Ægyptian* Months.

The Congruity betwixt the Months of this Epocha and the Julian Months.

		Incidit Neomenia Menſis
1.	Thoth in	29 *Auguſti.*
2.	Paophi	28 *Septembr.*
3.	Athyr	28 *Octobr.*
4.	Chojac	27 *Novembr.*
5.	Tybi	27 *Decembr.*
6.	Mechir	26 *Januarii.*
7.	Phamenoth	25 *Februarii.*
8.	Pharmuti	27 *Martii.* *B.* 26.
9.	Lachon	26 *April,* *B.* 25.
10.	Payni	26 *Maii,* *B.* 25.
11.	Epiphi	25 *Junii,* *B.* 24.
12.	Meſori	25 *Julii,* *B.* 24.
1.	Epagomen	24 *Auguſti,* *B.* 23.
2.	Epagomen	25 *Auguſti,* *B.* 24.
3.	Epagomen	26 *Auguſti,* *B.* 25.
4.	Epagomen	27 *Auguſti,* *B.* 26.
5.	Epagomen	28 *Auguſti,* *B.* 27.
6.	Epagomen	*Init. Anni,* *B.* 28. *Aug.*

CHAP.

CHAP. XLIV.

Of the Epocha of Conſtantine the Great, *and the Tranſactions under his Reign.*

1. Conſtantine the Great *was immediately after the Death of his Father* Conſtantius Chlorus, *both by his Teſtament and the Approbation of the Souldiery proclaimed* Cæſar. (*a*) Euſebius.
2. Conſtantius Chlorus *died on the 23d day of* July, *when* Conſtantius Cæſar *and* Maximianus Jovius *were both the 6th time* Roman *Conſuls, at the time of the* 10*th* Indiction. *See* Chron. Alexandrinus, Idacius, *and* (*b*) Socrates.
3. *The firſt Year of* Conſtantine the Great *is coincident with the 4th Year of the* 10*th Perſecution raiſed by* Diocleſian *againſt the Chriſtians.* Hieron. *in* Chron.
4. *This Perſecution began in the Year of the* Antiochian Æra 351, *in the* 19*th year of the Reign of* Diocleſian, *when* Diocleſian Auguſtus *was the* 8*th time and* Maximianus Herculius *the* 7*th time* Roman *Conſuli. See* (*c*) Euſebius.
5. *The Year in which the Tyrant* Maxentius *was vanquiſhed was the 6th year after the Death of* Conſtantius Chlorus, *and likewiſe of the Reigns of* Maxentius *and* Conſtantine the Great. *Maxentius, ſays the Panegyriſt, ſpeaking to* Conſtantine the Great, having ſquander'd away whole ſix years in Idleneſs, made

(*a*) L. 1. de Vit. Conſt. M. (*b*) L. 1. c. 1. (*c*) Chron. Alex.

his

his Birth-day remarkable by his Death, that the Tyrant might not defile that Sacred and Religious Septenary Number, by entring into the 7th Year of his Reign.

6. *The Tyrant* Maxentius *was ſlain when* Conſtantine *and* Licinius *were both the* 2*d time* Roman *Conſuls, in the* 4*th Year of the* 272*d Olympiad, according to St.* Hierome; towards the latter End of Autumn, *ſays* Nazarius, at the Beginning of the Winter (*about the Month of* October) *in the Year of Chriſt* 312.

7. *At the time of the* Decennalia *of* Conſtantine the Great, *that is to ſay, in the* 7*th Year of his Reign, he appointed his Son* Conſtantine *ſirnamed* Junior, Cæſar; *according to* (*d*) Euſebius; *and the* Chron. Alexandrinum *mentions that it happned in the Year of Chriſt* 316, *when* Sabinus *and* Ruffinus *were* Roman *Conſuls.*

8. *The ſame Year that the Council of* Nicæa *was finiſhed, was coincident with the Year when* Conſtantine the Great *celebrated the* Vicennalia, *being the Beginning of the* 21*ſt Year of his Reign. See* (*e*) Euſeb. (*f*) Socrates, (*g*) Sozomenus, *and* Iſhmael Ibn Ali *a* Mahometan *Writer by* (*h*) Langius.

9. Concerning the time of the Council of *Nicæa*, (*ſays* (*i*) Socrates) it was called together, as may be ſeen in the Annals on the 22d day of *May*, when *Paulinus* and *Julianus* were *Roman* Conſuls, in the 636th Year after the Reign of *Alexander the Great*, ſince the Beginning of the *Æra* of the *Seleucides*. *And the Edicts publiſhed by* Conſtantine the Great *ſhew theſe Characters to direct us to the* 325*th Year of Chriſt.*

(*d*) L. 4. c. 40. de Vit. Conſt. (*e*) L. 3. c. 14. L. 4. c. 47. de Vit. Conſt. (*f*) L. 1. c. 12. (*g*) L. 1. c. 24. (*h*) L. 1. p. 102. de Ann. Chr. (*i*) L. 1. c. 9.

10. *The Council of* Nicæa *did not laſt much above one Year; and according to* (*k*) Eutychius, *all the Biſhops were met in the City of* Nicæa, *within the Space of one Year and two Months.*

11. *The before-mentioned* Vicennalia *are ſaid to have been celebrated by* Conſtantine the Great *in the 2d Year of the 276th Olympiad, when* Conſtantine *was the 7th time and* Conſtantius Roman *Conſuls, in the Year of Chriſt* 326. *See* Euſ. in Chron. Faſt. Sic.

12. *In the 30th Year of* Conſtantine the Great, *when* Dalmatius *was proclaimed* Cæſar, Conſtantius *the 6th time and* Albinus *were* Roman *Conſuls, according to St.* (*l*) Jerome.

13. Conſtantine the Great *died on the 20th day of* May, *being then* Witſunday, *according to* (*m*) Euſebius *and the* Chron. Alexandrinum, *when* Felicianus *and* Titianus *were* Roman *Conſuls. Conſult* Sozomen, Chron. Alexandrinum, *and* (*n*) Idacius. *In the fourth Year of the 278th Olympiad, at the Age of 65 Years. See* Chron. Alexandr.

14. *From the Death of* Conſtantine the Great, *to count backwards to the Beginning of his Reign, are computed about 31 Years, according to* (*o*) Socrates; 30 *Years and 10 Months, according to* Idacius *and* (*p*) *St.* Jerome; 30 *Years, 9 Months and 27 Days, according to* (*q*) Onuphrius.

15. *The 341ſt Year of Chriſt, when* Marcellus *and* Probinus *were* Roman *Conſuls, was coincident with the 5th Year after the Death of* Conſtantine the Great; *and in the ſame Year was held the Council of* Antiochia. *See* (*q*) Socrates.

(*k*) In Annal. (*l*) Chron. Alexandr. (*m*) Lib. 4. c. 53. & 64. in Vit. Conſtant. (*n*) Hiſt. Tripart. (*o*) L. 1. c. 12. (*p*) In Chr. (*q*) In Faſt. (*r*) L. 2. c. 5. Hiſt. Eccleſ.

From

From these Characters it is evident, First, That Constantius Chlorus *died, and was succeeded in the Empire by* Constantine the Great *in the Year of the* Julian *Period* 5019, *Cycl.* ☉. 7. ☽. 3. *on the* 25*th day of* July. *Secondly, that* Maxentius *was vanquished in the Year of the* Julian *Period*, 5025, *towards the latter End of* September. *Thirdly, That the Council of* Nicæa *began in the Year of the* Julian *Period* 5038, *on the* 22*d day of* May, *and lasted till the Year of the* Julian *Period* 5039, *in* July; *at which time* Constantine the Great *celebrated the* Vicennalia *at* Nicomedia, *and in the next Year at* Rome. *Fourthly, That* Constantine the Great *died in the year of the* Julian *Period* 5056, *on the* 22*d day of* May.

If therefore from any certain year of the Julian *Period given, be subtracted* 5018 *years and* 7 *Months, the Residue shews the year since the Death of* Constantius Chlorus, *and the Beginning of the Reign of* Constantine the Great: *Likewise if you would investigate the year since the Death of* Maxentius, *and the Propagation of the Christian Doctrine throughout the whole* Roman *Empire, subtract from any known year of the* Julian *Period* 5024 *Years and* 9 *Months. And for the time since the Council of* Nicæa, 5037 *years and* 5 *Months; for the time since the Death of* Constantine the Great *subtract* 5049 *years and* 5 *months, and the Residues will be correspondent to the years of these several* Synchronisms. *But if to the known years of these several times before-mentioned, the above-named Numbers of Years and Months be added, the Products will be correspondent to the several years of the* Julian *Period.*

To investigate the Years since the Beginning of these Epocha's.

§. 1.

The History of Constantine the Great *is very uncertain.*

§. 1. (*s*) *Josephus Scaliger* speaking of the Times of *Const. the Great*, breaks out into these Words: *Nothing is more uncertain than the Beginnings of these Emperours, from* Carus *to* Valentinian. (*t*) *Baronius* is so positive in his Assertion that *Const. the Great* was not only first proclaimed *Cæsar* in *Britain*, but also was a Native of that Island, and was elevated to the Imperial Dignity by his Country-men, that he looks upon those who pretend to contradict it little better than mad Men. Nevertheless (*u*) *Justus Lipsius*, a Man of great Judgment, is of Opinion that this Emperour was born at *Tharsus* a City of *Bithynia*: And there are not a few who affirm according to (*x*) *Constantius Porphyrogennetus* and the Manuscript of *Fermicus*, that he was born at *Naissum* a City of *Dacia*. But we will only alledge the different Opinions of the Chronologers: The Author of the *Chron. Alexan.* says that *Const. Chlorus* died at *York* when *Constantius* the 6th time and *Maxim. Jovius* were *Roman* Consuls; with whom agrees (*y*) *Onuphrius*, when speaking of the Year when *FL. VALERIUS, CONSTANTIUS CHLORUS P. F. AUG. VI. ET GALERIUS VALERIUS MAXIMIANUS P. F. AUG. VI.* were *Roman* Consuls, he says further thus:

EODEM ANNO A. D. IV. KAL. AUGUSTI.

IMP. CÆSAR CONSTANTIUS AUG. MORTUUS EST.

(*s*) In Eusseb. p. 226. (*t*) Ad An. Christi 306. 16. (*u*) L. 4. c. 11. de magn. Rom. (*x*) L. 1. περὶ Θεμάτων. (*y*) In Fast.

The

The Ancient Author of the *Excerpta* alledged by (*z*) *Scaliger*, erroneously refers his Death to the Consulship of *Licinius* and *Crispus*. The Year of these Consuls mentioned by us is coincident with the Year since the Building of *Rome* 1058. But (*a*) *Orosius* says, that *Constantine* began his Reign in the Year 1061, since the Building of *Rome*. We have proved before, that *Const. the Great* was proclaimed *Cæsar* in the Year of Christ 306; which Opinion is approved of by (*b*) *Petav. in Ration. Tempor.* Nevertheless the same *Petavius*, in his Treatise *de Doct. Temp.* deduces the Beginning of the Reign of *Const. the Great* from the 305th Year of Christ, having read in the History of *Socrates* that *Const. the Great* died in the first Year of the 271st Olympiad, on the 25th day of *July*. *Scaliger* affirms, that *Const. the Great* was not proclaimed *Cæsar* till the Year of Christ 307. And (*c*) *Eusebius* says expressly, that *Const. the Great* reigned 31 Years and some Months; with whom agrees the Author of the *Chron. Alexand.* and *Joh. Monachus*, who allot 31 Years and 10 Months for the Reign of this Emperor. (*d*) *Philostorgius* affirms that he reigned beyond the 32d Year. On the other hand, St. *Jerome*, *Eutropius*, *Onuphrius*, and many more, who are of the same Opinion with us, allow no more than 30 Years and 10 Months for the Reign of *Const. the Great*; and *Scaliger* but 29 Years and 10 Months. There is no less Dispute about the Age of *Const. the Great*. *Eusebius* says he was not quite 64 Years old when he died, there wanting a few Months and Days. But *Socrates*, *Sozomenus*, *Ruffinus*, *Cassiodorus*, and a great many others, affirm that *Const. the Great* died in the 66th Year of his Age. They are also no

(*z*) P. 69. (*a*) L. 7. c. 17. (*b*) Part 2. l. 4. c. 11. (*c*) L. 4. c. 53 de Vit. Const. (*d*) L. 2. n. xvii.

less

less divided in their Opinions concerning those that were *Consuls* at *Rome* when *Const. the Great* died. Those who refer his Death to the Consulship of *Felicianus* and *Titianus* we have cited before. But in the Consular Records published by *Antonius Contius*, we find his Death coincident with the Consulship of *Ursus Lupulus* and *Polemius*, and consequently one Year later; and (e) *Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus* with the Consulship of *Constantius* the 2d time, and *Constans*, and consequently two Years later. And who is as much as able to enumerate, much less to decide the different Opinions concerning the Reign of *Const. the Great*? Our before-mentioned Characters are the surest Guides to extricate us out of this Labyrinth.

Whether Constantine *was proclaimed* Cæsar *before his Father's Death.*

§. 2. Some of the Ancients were of Opinion, that *Constantine* was proclaimed *Cæsar* before his Father's Death, which seems to be confirmed by the Authority of *Eusebius*, when he allots 32 Years for the Reign of this Emperour. And the Author of the *Chron. Alexandr.* says expressly, that the Year of the Death of *Constantius* was the 2d Year of *Constantine*. And (f) *Cassiodorus* speaking of the Consulship of *Diocletian* the 10th time, and *Maximus* the 7th time, has the following Words: Constantius *not troubling himself with any Business, was contented with the Title of* Augustus; *which is the Reason, that some years of his Reign are included in the Reign of his Son* Constantine, *who, as it was reported, was born from* Helen *his Concubine*, &c.

Whether Constantine *was declared Emperour and* Augustus *immediately after his Father's Death.*

§. 3. But tho' (g) *Eusebius* relates that *Constantine* was proclaimed Emperour and *Augustus* at the time of *Constantius* his Father's Funeral: yet if we give Credit to the ancient Monuments of these Times, we must conclude that *Constantius* either

(e) In Chron. (f) In Chron. (g) L. 1. c. 16. de Vit. Const.

im-

immediately after, or perhaps before his Father *Conſtantius*'s Death, was declared *Cæſar*; but did not take upon him the Titles of *Imperator* or *Auguſtus* till after his Marriage with *Fl. Maximiana Fauſta*, the Daughter of *Maximianus Herculeus*; as among others appears out of the Oration of the Panegyriſt, ſpoken in the Preſence of *Maximian* and *Conſtantine Auguſtus*; where, among others, he has theſe Words: TIBI CÆSARI ADDITUM NOMEN IMPERII; And further, as follows; ET TIBI, CONSTANTINE, PER SOCERUM NOMEN IMPERII ACCREVERIT, &c.

Whether Conſtantine was the firſt Chriſtian Emperour.

§. 4. There is a Diſpute among the Hiſtorians, whether *Conſt. the Great*, or the Emperour *Philip*, ſirnamed *Arabs*, was the firſt Chriſtian Emperour. (*b*) *Euſebius* affirms, that already in his time it was granted by many, that this *Philip* had embraced the Chriſtian Religion; and (*i*) *Oroſius* ſays expreſly, that this *Philip* was the firſt of all the Chriſtian Emperours; and that *Conſtantine* was the firſt Chriſtian Emperour except *Philip*. On the other hand, *Euſebius* ſeems to call in queſtion the Chriſtianity of *Philip*; when he ſays, that among all the other Emperours, *Conſtantine* was the only one who was initiated by the holy Baptiſm; with whom agrees in Opinion *Lactantius* in his Preface, when he ſays, that he was the firſt of all the *Roman* Princes who had laid aſide his erroneous Opinion, and was come to the true Knowledge of God; and relates of this *Philip Arabs*, that he was an Idolater. *Scaliger* is of Opinion, that in Reality he was a Pagan, but pretended to be a Chriſtian for ſome Reaſons of State: So that the beſt Chronologers agree in this Point, that the Epocha of the Chri-

(*b*) L. 5. c. 27. Hiſt. Eccl. (*i*) L. 7. c. 18.

stian Emperours begins with the Reign of *Conſt. the Great.*

The Origin of the Decennalia *and* Vicennalia.

§. 5. *Auguſtus* having refuſed to accept of the Empire any otherwiſe than for the Space of ten Years, was the firſt who inſtituted the *Decennalia*; concerning which (*k*) *Dio Caſſius* has theſe following Words: Cæſar, *to remove from himſelf all Suſpicion of being ambitious of the Royal Dignity, ſo odious to the* Romans, *but much coveted by him; for which Reaſon he would accept of the Government of the Provinces for* 10 *years, only, adding theſe Words; That if he could reduce them to a State of Tranquillity in a leſs time, he would ſooner abdicate the Government.*

Concerning the time of the Nicæan *Council.*

§. 6. There is alſo a great Queſtion among the Hiſtorians how long the Council of *Nicæa* laſted. *Scaliger* is of Opinion that it was diſſolved in the 3d Year after it was called together; with whom agree (*l*) *Bellarminus* and (*m*) *Genebrardus*, but is contradicted by *Baronius* and *Petavius*. Thoſe who diſagree with *Scaliger*, alledge in their behalf the Words of *Alexander* and *Metrophanes* in (*n*) *Phot.* which are as follows: *The Council being ended after three years and a half, for it began on the* 15*th day of* April, *and continued till three years after, not only till the ſame Month of* April, *but till the* September *next following*; But I look upon it as unqueſtionable, that the End of the Council of *Nicæa* ought to be made coincident with the *Vicennalia* of *Conſt. the Great.*

(*k*) L. 53. (*l*) L. 1. c. 1. de Concil. (*m*) Ad An. Chr. 338. (*n*) Col. 256.

CHAP.

CHAP. XLV.

Of the Epocha and the Encœnia *of* NEW ROME, *or the City of* Conſtantinople, *and the Diviſion of the* Roman *Empire into the Eaſtern and Weſtern Empire.*

1. *The firſt year of this Epocha is coincident with the* 25*th year of the Reign of* Conſtantine the Great, *according to St.* Jerome *and* Cedrenus.
2. *The ſolemn Conſecration of this City was made in the Third* Indiction, *according to the ſame* Cedrenus.
3. *When the ſecond* Feria *did fall upon the* 11*th day of* May, *according to the ſame* Cedrenus, *and the Anonymous Author of the* Chron. Alexandrinum *cited by* (a) Scaliger.
4. *In the year of the World, according to the* Greek *Computation,* 5838. *according to* Zonaras, Cedrenus *and* Joh. Monachus.
5. *In the* 2*d year of the* 277*th Olympiad. See* Chron. Euſ. Hieron.
6. *In the* 360*th year ſince the Reign of* Auguſtus, *according to* Suidas.
7. *When* Gallicanus *and* Symmachus *were* Roman *Conſuls, according to the* Chronicon *of* Caulabon *cited by* Scaliger.
8. *At the time of the* 5*th* Indiction, Mavortius *being then alone Conſul at* Rome, *in the* 197*th year after the Building of* Conſtantinople, *the*

(a) P. 284.

Emperour Justinus *did appoint* Justinianus, *his Nephew, his Successour in the Empire, on the first day of* April, *according to* Comes Marcellinus.

From these Characters it is evident that the Enceenia, *or Consecration of the City of* Constantinople *did happen on the 11th day of* May *in the* 5043*d year of the* Julian *Period, Cycl.* ☉. 3. ☽. 8.

If therefore from any certain year given of the Julian *Period, be subtracted* 5042 *Years and* 4 *Months, the Residue shews the year since the Beginning of the Epocha of* Constantinople: *And if the said Sum of* 5042 *Years and* 4 *Months be added to the known Year of this Epocha, the Product will be correspondent to the Year of the* Julian *Period.*

How any certain year given of the Julian *Period, to find out the year since the beginning of this Epocha.*

Why this Epocha is treated of in particular.

§. 1. THIS Epocha is scarce mentioned by some Chronologers; Nevertheless we judg'd it not for our Purpose to pass it by in Silence. First, because the *Constantinopolitans* always made a great Account of this Epocha, especially in their publick Records, as may be seen in (*b*) *Scaliger*. And in the Imperial Laws of (*c*) *Valentinian* and *Theodosius*, we read these following Words: *Kalendarium quoque Januarium consuetos dies otio mancipamus. His adjicimus NATALITIOS DIES URBIUM MAXIMARUM ROMÆ atque CONSTANTINOPOLIS, in quibus debent jura differri, quia ab ipsis nata sunt.* Secondly, because this occasioned the greatest and most pernicious Change in the Government of the *Roman* Empire. Thirdly, because by this Innovation the Number of Patriarchs increasing, this gave Birth to great and innumerable Contests among the Bishops. Consult (*d*) *Zonar.* & *G. Codinus.*

(*b*) L. 5. de Em. Temp. (*c*) L. 7. de Feriis. (*d*) C. 3. Annal.

§. 2.

§. 2. *Suidas* in his Lexicon says, that the Ancients by the Word *Encænia* understood any publick Solemnity, or rather Initiation: In which Sence are taken the *Encænia* of the Temple of *Solomon*, of the *Maccabæans* and Emperours. Among the *Latines* they were called *Dedications* or *Consecrations*, being certain Days appointed to give Thanks to God Almighty on the Account of something of Moment brought to a happy Conclusion, and to implore him for the Continuance of his Mercies. Of these Consecrations consult the (e) *Jus Canonicum*. *The Derivation of the Word* Encænia.

§. 3. All the Historians agree in this Point, that the City of *Constantinople* was founded by *Const. the Great* upon the Ruines of the ancient *Byzantium*; but they are of different Opinions concerning the Origin of this Word. Most of them however agree in this, that *Byzantium* received its Name from its Founder King *Byzantes*, or a famous Commander at Sea called *Buzes*. *Georgius* has this following fabulous Tradition; That *Byzantes* was Son of *Neptune*, and *Cornuta* the Daughter of *Io*, a Concubine of *Jupiter*; and that he received his Name from the Nymph *Bexia*, who had educated him in *Thrace*. *This* Byzantes, says *Codinus*, *after he had made himself famous by his Exploits among those inhabiting the Mountains of* Thrace, *founded the City of* Byzantium. *The Derivation of the Word* Byzantium.

§. 4. The Oracle of *Delphos* had pronounced the following Words concerning the City and Inhabitants of the Ancient *Byzantium*: *That the Inhabitants of that City, situate upon the* Thracian *Shoar near the* Pontus Euxinus *should enjoy great Happiness.* But they are very infamous for their Intemperance; for which Reason they were surnamed ἀκόλασοι. *The Traditions of the Ancients concerning the City of* Byzantium.

(e) C. 1. de Consecrationibus.

And (*f*) *Ælianus Varro* upbraids them with Drunkenness, prostituting their Wives to Strangers, and Cowardice. And *Menander* says, that the Merchants of *Byzantium* were so much addicted to Wine, that they rarely used to stir from the Bottle all Night.

Concerning the Destruction of the ancient Byzantium.

§. 5. We read of several unfortunate Wars waged by the *Byzantines* in the ancient Histories; but the two last are most remarkable. In the first of these two they were, according to *Zonaras*, closely besieged by *Severus*; which Siege they endured with a great deal of Bravery and Constancy for three Years; when, after a most obstinate Resistance, having consumed all their Provisions, and lived for some time upon Human Flesh, they were forced to surrender to *Severus*, who killed all their Soldiers and chief Men, and dismantled the City: But the 2d proved the total Destruction of this famous City under *Gallienus*; who, as *Trebellius Pollio* (*g*) relates it, did make such a Slaughter among the Inhabitants of *Byzantium*, that not one Family escaped his Wrath, unless it were perhaps such as happed to be at the same time in Foreign Parts.

What induced Constantine *to found this new City upon the Ruines of the ancient* Byzantium.

§. 6. (*h*) *Sozomenus* affirms, that *Const. the Great* having taken a Resolution to build a City after his own Name, first attempted to lay its Foundation upon the Ruines of the Ancient *Troy*, near the Sepulchre of *Ajax*; but being admonished in a Dream to desist from that Enterprize, he had pitched upon the old *Byzantium*, which he fortified with very strong Walls. There are others who believe that *Const. the Great* did build this City as a Bulwark and Check to the Greatness of the *Persians* who were then very formidable in the East; and to keep the *Syrians* and other Neighbouring Nations in Obedience by this potent City.

(*f*) L. 3. c. 14. Hist. (*g*) In Gal. (*h*) L. 2. c. 2.

§. 7.

§. 7. And *Const. the Great* being very desirous to enlarge his new City to the utmost of his Power, gave all imaginable Encouragement to Strangers, by his great Liberality towards them. And St. *Jerom* observes that *Const. the Great* was so ambitious of enlarging this City, that he transferred Colonies from other Places thither. (*i*) *Sozomenus* ascribes this sudden Encrease of *Constantinople* partly to the Piety of the Emperour, partly to the Charity and Liberality of its Inhabitants to Strangers. *The Reason of the sudden Increase of this City.*

§. 8. But the Chronologers are divided in their Opinions concerning the true Beginning of the *Encænia* of *New Rome*. Some there are who make them coincident with the same Year the Council of *Nicæa* was finished; among whom is (*k*) *Nicephorus Callisthus*, who has been severely reprimanded upon this Account by *Camerarius*. Others differ two Years from our Opinion, induced by the Authority of *Cassiodorus*; who says, that under the Consulship of *Pacatianus* and *Hilarianus*, the City of *Byzantium* was called *Constantinople* after *Const. the Great*. But (*l*) *Cæsar Baronius* has sufficiently demonstrated, that *Cassiodorus* was led into this Error by his wrong Computation of the Years of the Reign of *Constantine*. Some recede but one Year from our Assertion, making the *Encænia* of *Constantinople* coincident with the Year 331 of Christ, and with the Consulship of *Annius Bassus* and *Ablabius Ægyptius*; concerning which (*m*) *Onuphrius* cites these following Words: *The Authors differ about the Beginning of this Epocha.*

HOC ANNO ANTE DIEM V. EID. MAI. CONSTANTINOPOLIS NOVA ROMA AB IMPERATORE CÆSARE CONSTANTINO MAXIMO PIO FELICE AUGUSTO DEDICATA EST.

(*i*) L. 2. c. 2. (*k*) L. 8. c. 26. (*l*) Ad An. Chr. 330 (*m*) Fast. Consl.

But *Onuphrius*'s Opinion being not agreeable to the Relations of the ancient Historians, deserves in no wise any Preference before ours; which is founded upon the Authority of the best Monuments of Antiquity.

How to reconcile these Differences.

§. 9. To reconcile the different Opinions concerning the Beginning of this Epocha, it is to be observed that those that fix its Beginning sooner than we, have begun their Computation from the time its first Foundation was laid by *Constantine*; which was some Years before its Consecration; Whereas those who reduce this Epocha from the 28th Year of the Reign of *Constantine* have had respect to the time of its full Perfection, some Years after its Consecration; as evidently appears from the Words of (n) *Philostorgius*, who relates it to that time when *Constantinople* appeared in its full Glory, so as to contend for the Superiority with *Rome* it self. But as to the Opinion of *Georgius Codinus Curopalates*, who in his *Origines Constantinopolitanæ*, published by *Georgius Dousa*, makes the Beginning of this Epocha coincident with the 12th year of the Reign of *Constantine*, it does not deserve an Answer.

Concerning the Division of the Roman Empire.

§. 10. The Design of *Const. the Great* to increase the Power and Strength of the Empire by *Old* and *New Rome*, one in the Western, the other in the Eastern Part of the Empire, proved very pernicious in the End; this unadvised Division having exposed the Empire to Ruin and Destruction. And it has been well observed by (o) *Onuphrius*, that *Const. the Great*, by removing the 15 Legions that guarded the Borders of the *Danube* and *Rhine*, had invited the barbarous Nations of the *Goths*, *Alans*, *Burgundians*, and *Franks* to over-run the Western Empire.

(n) L. 2. c. 2. (o) C. 40 de Comit.

CHAP.

CHAP. XLVI.

Of the Turkish *Epocha, commonly called the* Epocha of Hegira.

This Epocha begins from the time of the Flight of *Mahomet* from *Mecchа*, which, without Contradiction, happened in the Year of Christ 602, or in the Year of the *Julian* Period 5335, on the 16th day of *July*, on the 6th *Feria*. But this Epocha being composed of *Lunar* Years, consisting of 354 Days, 8 Hours, and 864 Scruples, its Connection is very difficult with the *Julian* Years.

§. 1. SOme are of Opinion, that this Epocha owes its Offspring to *Hagar*, from whence the *Turks* deduce their Origin. But it seems more probable that the same has its Beginning from the time of the Flight of their Prophet *Mahomet* from the City of *Mecchа*. Consult *Hottin. in Hist. Orient. p.* 260. *& seq.* *The Origin of this Epocha.*

§. 2. The *Turks* compute their Years by 12 Months, whose Names are thus express'd by *Gravius*: *The twelve Months of the Turks.*

1. *Moharram.*	5. *Jomada Prior.*	9. *Ramadan.*
2. *Safar.*	6. *Jom. Posterior.*	10. *Schawal.*
3. *Rabia prior.*	7. *Rajab.*	11. *Dulkaadah.*
4. *Rabia poster.*	8. *Schauban.*	12. *Dulheggiah.*

CHAP.

CHAP. XLVII.

Of the Persian *Epocha, called commonly* YEZDEJERD.

1. *The Years of the* Persian *Epocha are equivalent to the* Nabonassarean *or ancient* Ægyptian *Years.*
2. *This Epocha derives its Name from* Yezdejerd, *the Son of* Schariar, *the last* Persian *King.*
3. *The* Græcian *Epocha precedes the* Persian 344324 *Days, and the* Arabian *is* 3624 *Days before the* Persian *Epocha, according to the Testimony of* Ulug Begg *an* Indian *Prince on both Sides of the River* Ganges.
4. *The* Persian *Æra is coincident with the* 1379*th Year, and* 3*d Month, or* 90 *Days of the* Nabonassarean *Epocha, according to* Alfraganus.

From these Characters it is evident that this Æra *began in the Year of the* Julian *Period* 5345, *on the* 16*th day of* June, *on the third* Feria. *But because the Connection of these Years with the* Julian *Years is very difficult, by reason of their Difference, it will be too long to be inserted here.*

The Disposition of the Years of this Epocha.

§. 1. THE Disposition of the Years of the *Persian* Epocha is the same with the *Nabonassarean* Years, every one consisting of 365 Days; and their Months are ταιακονθήμεροι, they add Five Days to the Month *Aban*, which the Astronomers commonly insert in the latter end of the Year. The Names of their Months are thus express'd by *Gravius*.

1. *Fer-*

1. *Fervadin.*
2. *Ardabahesht.*
3. *Chordad.*
4. *Tir.*
5. *Mordad.*
6. *Shariwar.*
7. *Meher.*
8. *Adan.*
9. *Abur.*
10. *Di.*
11. *Behman.*
12. *Esfandarmed.*

§. 2. This Epocha has, beyond all Question, its Beginning from the Times of *Yezdejerd*, or the Year of the *Julian* Period 5345. The only Question is, whether it began with the Beginning of the Reign of this Prince, or from the time of his Death. *Alfraganus*, *Scaliger*, *Christmannus*, and several others, are for the last; to wit, from the time that *Yezdejerd* was vanquish'd and slain by *Otheman* near the City of *Merga*. But the before-mentioned *Ulug Begg*, cited by *Gravius*, deduces its Origin from the Beginning of the Reign of this Prince. *The Origin of this Epocha.*

CHAP. XLVIII.

Of the Jellalæan *or* Gelalæan *Epocha, otherwise called the Royal Epocha, and the Epocha of the* Sultans.

This Epocha began in the Year of the Julian *Period* 5792, *on the* 14*th day of* March, *at the time of the* Æquinox. *It is composed of* Solar *Years consisting of* 365 *Days*, 5 *Hours*, 49 *Minutes and* 53″; *From whence it is evident, that to investigate its Connection with the* Julian *Period, you must subtract* 5791 *Years and* 7 *Months.*

§. 1.

For what Uſe this Epocha was invented.

§. 1. THIS Epocha is purely *Aſtronomical*, invented on purpoſe for the Convenience of finding out the exact time of the Vernal *Æquinox*; at which time the *Perſians* celebrate a moſt ſolemn Feſtival. Of which ſee (*a*) *Olearius*.

The three-fold Perſian Calendar.

§. 2. The *Perſians* make uſe of three ſeveral ſorts of Calendars: For they compute by the *Turkiſh* Years, or thoſe of *Hegira*, by the *Nabonaſſarean*, and laſtly, by the *Jellalean* Years. The firſt is obſerved in their Solemnities; the ſecond is made uſe of by private Perſons in keeping their Accounts; the third in their great Feaſt called NEURUZ.

Who was the Founder of this Epocha.

§. 3. (*b*) *Scaliger* mentions not only the Name of the Prince, who was the firſt Founder of this Epocha, but likewiſe thoſe who were of his Council. His Name was *Albu Arſalan Elſelegeuki, Elhavarax, Muſchahi Sultan Coraſan*: The Names of his eight Counſellours are as follows; *Omar, Elhaiami, Abu Hali, Haſen* the Son of *Haiſham, Elbiruni, Abu, Elvaapha, Elbuzgiani, Ellukari*, Judge of the Diſtrict of *Elphahani* and *Abenſina*, commonly called *Aviſena*.

(*a*) Itin. Perſ. part. 2. p. 307. & 494. (*b*) L. 4. de Em. Temp.

FINIS.

Courteous Reader,

TO give you at once a ſhort View of all theſe Epocha's, which (after our general Doctrine of Time) we have treated of in this Epitome; and to ſhew you the moſt compendious Way of making an exact Connection betwixt the ſeveral Epoch's, we have exhibited in a ſmall Table the Difference betwixt the *Julian* Period and all the other Epocha's. As, for Example; If the Year of Chriſt 1664, and the fifth Month of the Year, commonly called the Month of *May*, be given to find out the Synchroniſms of theſe Epocha's; you muſt know the Year of the *Julian* Period: If therefore you add out of the above-mentioned Table 4713 Years to the before-ſaid Sum, the Product will ſhew you the Year of the *Julian* Period, to wit, 6377, which is correſpondent to the known Year of Chriſt. On the other hand, If you ſubtract from the ſame Year the Sum you find oppoſite to each Epocha, this ſhews you the true Method of making a juſt Connection betwixt theſe Epocha's and the known Year of Chriſt. It is further to be obſerved, That where you find an Aſterisk or *, affixed to any of theſe Epocha's, it indigitates, that the uſual Computation of the Years of this Epocha is not congruous to the *Julian* Period; and that therefore the Connection betwixt them is to be look'd for in our *Computiſtica*.

From

From the beginning of the *Julian* Period, to

		Y.	M.
1.	*The Creation of the World,*	763	9
2.	*The* Jewiſh *Epocha,*	952	8
3.	Moſes's *Flood,*	2419	10
4.	Porphyrius's Chaldaick *Epocha,*	2480	
5.	Aſſyriac *Kingdom,*	2537	
6.	*Nativity of* Abraham,	2711	
7.	——*his Calling,*	2786	
8.	Iſaac's *Nativity,*	2811	
9.	Abraham's *Death,*	2886	
10.	*Beginning of the Kingdom of the* Argives,	2856	
11.	*Beginning of the Kingdom of* Athens,	3157	
12.	*Departure out of* Ægypt.	3216	3
13.	*Entr. of the* Iſraelites *into* Palæſtine,	3261	9
14.	*Their Tilling it,*	3262	9
15.	*Deſtruction of* Troy,	3529	5
16.	David's *Reign,*	3653	
17.	*Firſt Foundation of the Temple,*	3696	4
18.	*Its* Encœnia,	4703	9
19.	*The Defection of* Jeroboam,	3733	
20.	Arbaces, *the 1ſt King of the* Medes,	3838	
21.	Mandaces, *the 2d,*	3865	
22.	Soſarmus, *the 3d,*	3915	
23.	Artica, *the 4th,*	3945	
24.	Cardicea, *the 5th,*	3996	
25.	Phraortes, *the 6th,*	4057	
26.	Cyaxares, *the 7th K. of the* Medes,	4080	
27.	*The Beginning of* Aſtyages,	4020	
28.	*The End,*	4154	
29.	*The Olympiads,*	3937	6
30.	*The* Varronian *Epocha of the Building of the City,*	3960	3
31.	*The* Catonian,	3961	3
32.	* *The* Nabonaſſarean *Epocha,*	3966	2
33.	*Deſtruction of* Samaria,	3990	
34.	*The Beginning of* Nabuchadonoſor,	4105	

		Y.	M.
35.	LXX *Years Captivity*,	4113	
36.	*Deſtruction of the firſt Temple*,	4123	7
37.	*The Beginning of* Cyrus *in* Perſia,	4154	
38.	*in* Babylon,	4175	
39.	*Flight of the Kings*,	4205	2
40.	*The Battle at* Marathon,	4222	7
41.	*at* Salamis,	4233	8
42.	*The Beginning of the* Pelopon. War,	4282	3
43.	*The Beginning of the 70 Weeks of* Daniel,	4291	
44.	*The Battle at* Gaugamel,	4382	9
45.	*The Begin. of the* Calip. *Period*,	4383	6
46.	*The Death of* Alexander,	4390	3
47.	*The Epocha of the* Seleucides,	4401	3
48.	*The Death of* Mattathias Aſmonæus,	4547	
49.	*The Reſtauration of the* Jews, Mac.	4548	
50.	*The Epocha of* Simon,	4570	
51.	*The* Antiochian *Epocha*,	4664	9
52.	*The* Julian *Epocha*,	4668	0
53.	*The Beginning of the Reign of* Herod,	4673	
54.	*The taking of* Jeruſalem,	4676	
55.	*The Death of* Herod,	4712	2
56.	*The* Spaniſh Æra,	4673	
57.	*The Battle at* Actium,	4682	8
58.	*The taking* Alexandria,	4683	7
59.	*The Epocha of the* Auguſtus's,	4686	
60.	*The true Birth of Chriſt*,	4711	
61.	*The Vulgar*,	4713	
62.	*The Paſſion of Chriſt*,	4745	3
63.	*The Deſtruction of the ſecond Temple*,	4782	7
64.	*The Beginning of the* Diocleſian *or the Æra of Martyrs*,	4996	8
65.	*The* Diocleſian *Perſecution*,	5015	3
66.	*The Death of* Conſtantius Chlorus,	5018	7
67.	*The Conqueſt of* Maxentius,	5024	
68.	*The* Nicæan *Council*,	5037	5

69.

69.	*The Death of* Conſtantine the Great,	5049	5
70.	*The* Encœnia *of* Conſtantinople,	5042	4
71.	* *The Epocha of the* Hegira,	5334	6
72.	* *The Epocha of* Yezdejerd,	5344	5
73.	*The Epocha of* Jellaiæan,	5791	3

Advertiſement.

AN Help and Exhortation to worthy Communicating; or a Treatiſe deſcribing the Meaning, worthy Reception, Duty and Benefits of the Holy Sacrament, and anſwering the Doubts of Conſcience and other Reaſons, which moſt generally detain Men from it: Together with ſuitable Devotions added; By *John Kettlewell*, late Vicar of *Coles-Hill* in *Warwickſhire*. The 3d Edition, each Page corrected and amended by the Author's own Hand, with large Additions.

Printed for *Alexander Baſvile* at the *Dial* againſt St. *Dunſtan*'s Church in *Fleetſtreet*.